

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

of the Protestant Episcopal Church



DECEMBER, 1958



A STUDY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OFFICE OF
PRESIDING BISHOP OF THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL
CHURCH, 1794-1944

By William Joseph Bernds

ARMY CHAPLAINS AT FRONTIER POSTS, 1830-1860

By Richard D. Gamble

THE SOCIAL THOUGHT OF WILLIAM AUGUSTUS
MUHLENBERG

By Richard G. Becker

THE HISTORY AND SYMBOLISM OF THE FLAG OF THE
EPISCOPAL CHURCH

By Jane Houghtaling Luce

"THE WAY OF PEACE": A Sermon Preached by Bishop Charles
Henry Brent (1862-1929) in Canterbury Cathedral, Novem-
ber 25, 1928

With Notes by the Editor

Index to Volume XXVII (1958)

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY: \$1.25 THE COPY—\$5 THE YEAR

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

of the Protestant Episcopal Church



PUBLISHED AT 5 PATERSON STREET, NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY, BY AUTHORITY OF GENERAL CONVENTION, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A JOINT COMMISSION OF SAID CONVENTION, AND UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

CANON WALTER H. STOWE, S.T.D.
5 Paterson Street, New Brunswick, N. J.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

REV. DuBOSS MURPHY, D.D.
Tuscaloosa, Alabama

PROF. FRANK J. KLINGBERG, Ph.D.
Los Angeles, California

RT. REV. EDWARD L. PARSONS, D.D.
San Francisco, California

REV. EDWARD R. HARTY, Ph.D.
New Haven, Connecticut

REV. WILLIAM W. MANROSS, Ph.D.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

PROF. RICHARD G. SALOMON, Ph.D.
Cincinnati, Ohio

CANON C. RANKIN BARNES, S.T.D.
New York City

REV. EDWARD H. ECKEL, S.T.D.
Tulsa, Oklahoma

JOINT COMMISSION OF GENERAL CONVENTION

RT. REV. WALTER H. GRAY, D.D., *Chairman*

REV. CANON WALTER H. STOWE, S.T.D., *Vice-Chairman*

REV. CANON C. RANKIN BARNES, S.T.D., *Secretary*

RT. REV. THOMAS N. CARRUTHERS, D.D.

RT. REV. NELSON M. BURDOUGH, D.D.

RT. REV. HENRY H. SHIRES, S.T.D.

REV. G. MACLAREN BRYDON, D.D.

REV. WILLIAM W. MANROSS, Ph.D.

COL. JACKSON A. DYKMAN, DCL.

PROF. FRANK J. KLINGBERG, Ph.D.

PROF. RICHARD G. SALOMON, Ph.D.

LAWRENCE F. LONNIE, Ph.D.

PUBLICATION AND EDITORIAL OFFICE: 5 PATERSON ST., NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.
Address all subscriptions to HISTORICAL MAGAZINE as above. Five Dollars per year in advance for subscriptions within the U. S. A. Six Dollars per year in advance for foreign subscriptions. Checks should be drawn payable to HISTORICAL MAGAZINE.

All communications and manuscripts for publication, including books and pamphlets for review, to be addressed as above. The editors are not responsible for the accuracy of the statements of contributors.

Entered as second-class matter September 17, 1935, at the Post Office at New Brunswick, N. J., with additional entry at the Post Office at Lebanon, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

of the Protestant Episcopal Church



Vol. XXVII DECEMBER, 1958

No. 4



CONTENTS

•

	<i>Page</i>
A STUDY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OFFICE OF PRESIDING BISHOP OF THE AMERICAN EPISCO- PAL CHURCH, 1794-1944	254
<i>By William Joseph Barnds</i>	
ARMY CHAPLAINS AT FRONTIER POSTS, 1830-1860 ..	287
<i>By Richard D. Gamble</i>	
THE SOCIAL THOUGHT OF WILLIAM AUGUSTUS MUHLENBERG	307
<i>By Richard G. Becker</i>	
THE HISTORY AND SYMBOLISM OF THE FLAG OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH	324
<i>By Jane Houghtaling Luce</i>	
"THE WAY OF PEACE": A Sermon Preached by Bishop Charles Henry Brent (1862-1929) in Canterbury Cathedral, November 25, 1928	332

Index to Volume XXVII (1958)

A Study of the Development of the Office of Presiding Bishop of the American Episcopal Church 1794-1944

By William Joseph Barnds*

Introduction

IN an article about the Presiding Bishops, the Rev. Dr. C. Rankin Barnes, secretary of the House of Deputies of the General Convention, and secretary of the National Council of the Church, wrote:

The office of Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, as now constituted, is the result of a long and gradual evolution. It has slowly grown from the vague privilege of presiding over meetings of a handful of bishops at their triennial gatherings to the minutely defined, constitutional, full-time position of the spiritual head of a national Church, who also serves as executive and administrator. The process by which the office has gradually developed is a fascinating one, reflecting both the personalities of the men who have held it and the growing national consciousness of the Church.¹

In his article, Dr. Barnes discussed the personalities and contributions of the various Presiding Bishops, and presented biographical material about them. Unlike Dr. Barnes' article, the purpose of this paper is to trace the long and gradual development of the office of Presiding Bishop from 1789 to 1944, and only incidentally to discuss the personalities and contributions of the respective Presiding Bishops. It is, of course, necessary at the beginning of this paper to deal primarily with the personalities of the various Presiding Bishops, but eventually such discussion is tapered off, and the emphasis is placed on discovering the mind of the Church, as reflected in successive meetings of General Convention, concerning the office of Presiding Bishop.

There have been three main periods in the development of the office of Presiding Bishop from 1789 to 1944. The first period was that during which the Presiding Bishop was primarily the Presiding Bishop of the

* The author is rector of St. Paul's Church, Ogallala, Nebraska.—*Editor's note.*

¹ *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, XVIII (June, 1949), p. 97.

House of Bishops, whose duties were confined to those concerning the episcopate, which devolved upon him because the Church regarded him as the natural person to perform those duties. The General Conventions apparently did not legislate with the intention of increasing the duties and powers of the Presiding Bishop. Rather, those duties and powers were increased as a result of the legislation of various General Conventions on specific issues, chiefly those regarding the episcopate.

The second period was that in which the Presiding Bishop was both Presiding Bishop of the House of Bishops, and was, at the same time, regarded by the Church as its leader and head.

The third period was that during which the Presiding Bishop was primarily leader and head of the whole Church, and secondarily the Presiding Bishop of the House of Bishops.

First Period

The first period in the development of the office of Presiding Bishop began on October 5, 1789, when the third General Convention met in Philadelphia, and the Right Rev. Dr. Samuel Seabury, Bishop of Connecticut, was President of the House of Bishops. As President, he was, in effect, the Presiding Bishop of the House of Bishops. His main function was to preside over the House of Bishops and to sign its minutes. His successor, the Right Rev. Dr. Samuel Provoost, Bishop of New York, performed the same function at the General Convention held in New York in September, 1792.

Bishop Provoost's successor was the Right Rev. Dr. William White, Bishop of Pennsylvania, who presided over the House of Bishops at its meeting during the General Convention of September, 1795, held in Philadelphia, and who continued to preside over each meeting of the House of Bishops until his death on July 17, 1836. Under Bishop White, the office of Presiding Bishop began to grow and develop.

The General Convention of 1799 was the first one to grant power to the Presiding Bishop. It empowered the Presiding Bishop to call special meetings of the General Convention. Although General Convention invested the House of Bishops with this power, it was to be exercised by the Presiding Bishop. Canon I, passed at the 1799 Convention, read: "The right of calling special meetings of the General Convention shall be in the Bishops. This right shall be exercised by the presiding bishop. . . ."² Subsequent Conventions continued to increase the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Presiding Bishop.

At the General Convention of 1808, the canons were revised, show-

² 1799 *Journal of General Convention*, Canon I, p. 249.

ing that the Presiding Bishop was becoming a central person in the mind of the Church. In explaining one of the revisions made by this Convention, Col. Jackson L. Dykman has written:

Until 1808, any three bishops of the Church, who were satisfied with the testimonials laid before them, [re the election of a bishop] had power to consecrate a bishop-elect, even if all the other bishops were opposed thereto. Fortunately, however, no one was ever consecrated against the wishes of the other bishops.

When the canons were revised in 1808, this unwise provision was stricken out, and provision made that the testimonials of the diocese electing should be forwarded, not to any one or more bishops, but to the Presiding Bishop, who was also required to collect the opinions of all the bishops, and making the consent of a majority of the bishops necessary before consecration took place.³

This action of the 1808 Convention showed that the Presiding Bishop was one who was a natural and central person for the Church to turn to when the welfare of the whole Church was at stake.

The 1820 General Convention legislated in such a way as to show that the Presiding Bishop was regarded as a central person in the Church's organizational system. Canon IV, passed at this Convention, read:

"If, during the recess of the General Convention, the Church in any State or Diocese should be desirous of the consecration of a Bishop elect, the standing committee . . . may . . . communicate the desire to the standing committees . . . in the different States . . . and if the major number . . . consent . . . the standing committee concerned, shall forward the evidence of such consent, together with other testimonials, to the Presiding Bishop. . . ."⁴

This action meant that the Presiding Bishop was "in office" not only while actually presiding over the House of Bishops, but at times other than when that House was actually convened. The same canon provided that when a majority of the bishops had consented to the consecration, "the Presiding Bishop, with any two Bishops, may proceed to perform the same; or any three Bishops to whom he may communicate the testimonials."⁵ The Presiding Bishop was thus in charge of arranging for the consecration of bishops, although this was not yet mandatory upon him.

³ See p. 27, Vol. II of *Annotated Constitution and Canons for the Government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Adopted in General Conventions, 1789-1952*, by Edwin Augustine White, D.D., D.C.L.; Second Edition Revised, 1954, by Jackson A. Dykman, D.C.L. Published after Review by a joint committee of General Convention. Greenwich, Connecticut: Seabury Press.

⁴ *1820 Journal*, p. 567.

⁵ *Loc. cit.*

At the 1820 Convention, "The Protestant Episcopal Missionary Society in the United States; for Foreign and Domestic Missions" was founded. In its constitution it stated that "the presiding bishop of this church shall be the president of this society."⁶ Assuming that this society was functioning at times other than during the meetings of General Convention, its president, the Presiding Bishop, was, so to speak, the permanent "Chief Missionary" of the Church, and the "key man" in the missionary activity of the Church by virtue of his being head of a society concerned for the advancement of foreign and domestic missions.

The powers of the Presiding Bishop were increased again at the 1823 General Convention. This Convention amended the constitution to read that "in case there shall be an epidemic disease, or any good cause to render it necessary to alter the place fixed on for any . . . meeting of [General] Convention, the Presiding Bishop shall have it in his power to appoint another convenient place (as near as may be possible to the place so fixed on,) for the holding of such Convention."⁷ Not only did the Presiding Bishop retain the power to call special meetings of General Convention, but he could, after 1823, alter the place of meeting of General Convention for "any good cause."

An attempt was made to clarify the status of "presiding bishop" at the General Convention of 1832. The following "Rule of the House of Bishops" was adopted, and thus clarified this matter:

"The senior Bishop of the Church present at any General Convention is the presiding Bishop of the House of Bishops. The senior Bishop of this Church is the presiding Bishop for all other purposes contained in the Canons. The senior Bishop of this Church present at any consecration of a Bishop, is the presiding Bishop for that solemnity."⁸

At this same Convention, a canon "Of Episcopal Resignations" was passed which resulted in one more duty being added to the office of Presiding Bishop. Convention declared that when all the canonical stipulations had been fulfilled for the resignation of a bishop, the Presiding Bishop was required to declare that the resignation was confirmed.⁹ This could be done, however, only during the meeting of General Convention.

In 1835 the General Convention passed two canons dealing specifically with the subject of bishops, and indirectly with the Presiding Bishop. The canon "Of the Election of Bishops" stated that, if a diocese

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 588-9.

⁷ 1823 *Journal*, p. 95.

⁸ 1832 *Journal*, p. 447.

⁹ See Canon XXXII, Sec. 4, p. 4, of 1832 Canons.

requested the election of a bishop, that request should first be made known to the Presiding Bishop.¹⁰ Again the central position of the Presiding Bishop was acknowledged. A canon "Of Missionary Bishops" was also passed at this Convention, providing that in the event of a consecration of a missionary bishop, the Presiding Bishop was to officiate at the service, or authorize someone to act in his stead (with two other bishops).¹¹ Here the role of the Presiding Bishop as "Chief Missionary" was emphasized. This was the last piece of legislation enacted, bearing on the office of Presiding Bishop, while Bishop White held that office.

Most of the legislation passed up to the time of this Convention (1835) dealt with matters which only indirectly affected the Presiding Bishop. His duties had been gradually increased, whether or not the Church was cognizant that it was increasing them. At the time of Presiding Bishop White's death, the Constitution and Canons allowed the Presiding Bishop to preside over the House of Bishops, call special meetings of the General Convention, change the place of meeting of Convention for "any good cause," receive the testimonials of bishops-elect, arrange for the consecration of diocesan and missionary bishops, and declare when a bishop's resignation was confirmed. An interesting sidelight of the responsibility of Presiding Bishop at this early stage in the development of that office was that Presiding Bishop White wrote and issued all the Pastoral Letters addressed to the whole Episcopal Church until 1836.¹² After his death, however, this task was delegated to a committee, rather than to successive Presiding Bishops.

The Rev. Dr. William Wilson Manross, in discussing the office of Presiding Bishop during Bishop White's time, wrote:

The office was literally a presidency, and did not carry with it any other official function of importance, but White himself, in his later years, had something very close to the prestige and influence of a primate. He was the chief consecrator of every Bishop from Bass to McCrosky, and was president of most of the important organizations of the Church, such as the Missionary Society, the trustees of General Seminary (which he had helped to organize, and whose commencement he regularly attended) and the Protestant Episcopal Education Society. He was consulted on every question of importance, and his opinion had a weight which no one cared openly to oppose, while all parties were anxious to create the impression that they were in harmony with his views.¹³

¹⁰ 1835 *Journal*, p. 706.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 707.

¹² Julius H. Ward, *The Life and Times of Bishop White* (New York, Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1892), p. 63.

¹³ *William White, a Sketch of the First Bishop of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, Bishop White Prayer Book Society, 1934), p. 35.

Thus, the Presiding Bishop, in the person of Bishop White, exercised considerable influence in an advisory capacity, and he carefully guided the Church and its communicants.

Professor Bird Wilson of the General Theological Seminary, who was secretary of the House of Bishops while Bishop White was Presiding Bishop, said that Bishop White's powers as Presiding Bishop "were exercised and performed with so much judgment, prudence, and integrity, as to avoid the excitement of jealousy or dissatisfaction on account of his increased power and influence, or the manner in which they were exerted."¹⁴

Bishop White's successor as Presiding Bishop was the Right Rev. Dr. Alexander Viets Griswold, Bishop of the Eastern Diocese, who became Presiding Bishop on July 17, 1836, at the age of seventy. He held office for seven years, during which time the office developed very little. Bishop Griswold was reluctant even to accept the office at his advanced age, and scarcely half a year after assuming his new office he wrote a brother bishop: "I doubt the wisdom of making the oldest of our body the presiding bishop."¹⁵ He then outlined his reasons, emphasizing the factors of age, one's own diocesan responsibility, and the distances that had to be covered in fulfilling the duties of Presiding Bishop. These same elements figured prominently in discussions about the office for many succeeding years.

Bishop Griswold, like Bishop White, prepared the Pastoral Letters at the Conventions of 1835 and 1841, and as Presiding Bishop he consecrated six bishops. Only one duty was added to the office of Presiding Bishop during Bishop Griswold's incumbency. This was done at the General Convention of 1841, when a canon dealing with the trial of a bishop was passed. This canon stated that the presentment of any bishop who was to be tried "shall be addressed to the Presiding Bishop, who shall give notice with all convenient speed to the several Bishops then being within the territory of the United States. . . ."¹⁶

Bishop Griswold's biographer, in commenting on the fact that he had become the Presiding Bishop on Bishop White's death, said:

"It was with extreme reluctance that he consented to accept this title—his modest and retiring disposition always leading him to

¹⁴ *The Memoir of the Life of the Right Reverend William White, D.D.* (Philadelphia, James Kay, 1839), 157.

¹⁵ John S. Stone, *Memoir of the Life of Bishop Griswold* (Philadelphia, Stavely and McCalla, 1844), p. 403.

¹⁶ Canons of 1841, p. 31.

avoid, if possible, every thing which might render him conspicuous in the eyes of the world. When, however, he felt called upon, by a sense of duty, to assume an office, he would faithfully discharge its duties, no matter how much trouble and danger it might cost."¹⁷

This "extreme reluctance," coupled with Bishop Griswold's advanced age and ill health, may have deterred General Conventions from adding any more responsibility to the office of Presiding Bishop than they did.

When the Presiding Bishop died on February 15, 1843, he was succeeded by a man whose character and temperament were vastly different from the meek and humble Griswold. This man was the Right Rev. Dr. Philander Chase, Bishop of Illinois.

In 1844, while Bishop Chase was Presiding Bishop, the General Convention added to the responsibility of the office by amending the canon concerned with episcopal resignations to read: "In case a Bishop should desire to resign at any period not within six calendar months before the meeting of a General Conventon, he shall make known to the Presiding Bishop such his desire, with the reasons moving him thereto; whereupon the Presiding Bishop shall communicate without delay, a copy of the same to every Bishop of this Church, having Ecclesiastical jurisdiction. . . ."¹⁸ This canon thus allowed bishops to resign at times other than during the meetings of General Convention, and the Church showed again that the Presiding Bishop was not confined to exercising his office only during its sessions, or during services of consecration, or trials of bishops.

The 1850 General Convention passed a canon dealing with suspended bishops, which was very much like the canon of 1844 just quoted. The canon passed in 1850 stated:

"In case a suspended Bishop of this Church should desire to resign at any period not within six calendar months before the meeting of a General Convention, he shall make known by letter to the Presiding Bishop, such desire, whereupon the Presiding Bishop shall communicate a copy of the same to each Bishop of this Church having jurisdiction, and in case a majority of such Bishops shall return to the Presiding Bishop their written assent to such resignation, the same shall be deemed valid and final, and written information of the said resignation shall at once be communicated by the Presiding Bishop, to the Bishop and Diocese concerned, and to each Bishop of this Church."¹⁹

The Presiding Bishop thus had another duty added to his increasing

¹⁷ John N. Norton, *The Life of Bishop Griswold* (New York, 1857), pp. 66-7.

¹⁸ *1844 Journal*, p. 309.

¹⁹ *1850 Journal*: Canon II, Section 6, p. 57.

responsibilities, and the Church again showed the "central-character" of the Presiding Bishop and his office.

A resolution of significance to this subject was laid on the table in the House of Bishops during the 1850 Convention. It proposed that the term of office of the Presiding Bishop be limited to three years, and that the bishop next in succession hold the office from and after the close of the 1850 General Convention, for three years, to the close of the next triennial General Convention.²⁰ The *Journal* records: "Bishop DeLancey's Resolution, in regard to the office of Presiding Bishop, was called up, and the question being taken was lost."²¹ This was the first attempt made to relieve the senior bishop of the Church of the often burdensome task of being Presiding Bishop.

The 1850 Convention asked Presiding Bishop Chase, in lieu of a Pastoral Letter, to close its deliberations by making an address. From the content of this address it appears that the Church was troubled over Romanizing tendencies and repercussions from the Oxford Movement. The Presiding Bishop exhorted in his address: "Look at the whole ritual of the Church of Rome, full of idolatrous adoration of saints, and bowing down to a creature-God; look, and then compare with the pure worship in the Holy Scriptures, as set forth in our Protestant Prayer Book."²² Although it was not made a canonical part of the Presiding Bishop's duties to address each Convention at this time, it did in this instance indicate that the Church was beginning to look to the Presiding Bishop to be a spokesman for the Church in time of concern and distress over internal disturbances.

On the death of Presiding Bishop Chase, the Right Rev. Dr. Thomas Church Brownell, Bishop of Connecticut, became Presiding Bishop, and he presided over the House of Bishops at the 1853 General Convention. Because the Right Rev. Dr. Levi Sillman Ives, Bishop of North Carolina, had "abandoned the Communion of this Church" and become a Roman Catholic, this Convention was faced with enacting legislation to cope with this situation. Convention adopted a canon which required that if a bishop of this Church abandoned it, the deposition of that bishop must be pronounced "by the Presiding Bishop, with the consent of the majority of the members of the House of Bishops."²³

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

²² *Bishop Chase's Address, at the close of the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Cincinnati, Ohio, October 16, A.D., 1850* (Philadelphia, King and Baird, Printers), p. 14.

²³ *Canons of 1853*, p. 59.

Again the duties of the Presiding Bishop were increased, particularly concerning the episcopate.

Three years later, at the General Conveniton of 1856, considerable legislation was passed dealing with "The Trial of a Bishop" and involving indirectly the Presiding Bishop. Canon XI, Section 4, stated that the Presiding Bishop, to whom charges for offences of a bishop of this Church might be presented, should choose a board of inquiry of sixteen, to act in a way very similar to that of a grand jury.²⁴ The Presiding Bishop was also to give notice of the selection of the board to each member and direct him to attend at the time and place designated by him (the Presiding Bishop).²⁵ Thus the Presiding Bishop was given much power in organizing the board of inquiry concerning a bishop who was charged with some violation of the Constitution and Canons, etc. This was another duty of the Presiding Bishop which concerned the episcopate.

By 1859, a congregation of American Episcopalians worshipping in Paris, France, had been organized.²⁶ Since the congregation was not within the boundaries of some diocese of this Church, they petitioned the House of Bishops to allow them to function under the governance of the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.²⁷ Canon V of Title III, passed at the 1859 General Convention, required any such congregation like the one in Paris to produce a certificate and constitution, and to submit them either to the General Convention during its session, or to the Presiding Bishop of the House of Bishops at any other time.²⁸ When all was deemed satisfactory, "such Church or Congregation shall thereupon become subject to and placed under the Episcopal government and jurisdiction of such Presiding Bishop for the time being."²⁹ The canon also gave the Presiding Bishop the right to assign any other bishop to act for him as he desired at such churches. The clergymen of the various churches organized under this canon were to be subject to the jurisdiction of the Presiding Bishop, while in such church or congregation.³⁰

For the first time, the General Convention gave the Presiding

²⁴ *Journal of 1856*, p. 73.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 73-4.

²⁶ *1859 Journal*, p. 383.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 385.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

²⁹ *Loc. cit.*

³⁰ *Loc. cit.*

Bishop jurisdiction over a church or congregation and its clergyman outside the borders of his own diocese.

Presiding Bishop Brownell's health was quite impaired, and General Convention apparently did not think it wise to impose any more duties upon the Presiding Bishop. When he died at the age of eighty-five, he was the senior bishop of the Anglican Communion.³¹

His successor was the Right Rev. Dr. John Henry Hopkins, Bishop of Vermont, who had already presided over the House of Bishops in 1862, in New York, in the absence of Bishop Brownell who "was by reason of his advanced years, and the distance of the place of meeting from his residence, prevented from attending the sessions of the General Convention."³²

Although he was Presiding Bishop only three years, "those three years . . . added largely to his ordinary cares and labors," wrote his colleague, the Right Rev. Dr. John Williams. "No one who has yet occupied the office of Presiding Bishop has been called on to undertake so many and such extended journeys, or found his position beset with so many calls that involved active duty."³³

Very little was done by the General Conventions of the 1860's concerning the office of Presiding Bishop because "the chief subject of discussion was the state of the country and the duty of the Church in regard to it."³⁴ Bishop Hopkins disliked the ruling that the senior bishop was automatically the Presiding Bishop, but he did all in his power as Presiding Bishop to fulfil the office of mediator and pacifier between the North and the South, and to promote unification.

"Before the Convention met at Philadelphia on October 4, [1865] six months after the fall of Richmond and the surrender of Lee, Hopkins wrote to all the Southern bishops inviting them to attend and assuring them of 'a cordial welcome.' His known sympathy with the South and his close friendship with the strongest and most partisan of its bishops—Elliott of Georgia—gave to his message especial weight."³⁵

Edgar Legare Pennington, in "The Organization of the Protestant

³¹ *Historical Magazine*, VI (1937), p. 369.

³² *Journal of 1862*, p. 111.

³³ *Memorial of the Right Reverend John Henry Hopkins* (New York, Pott and Avery, 1868), p. 14.

³⁴ *The Life of the Late Right Reverend John Henry Hopkins*, by John Henry Hopkins, Jr. (New York, F. J. Huntington and Co., 1873), p. 325.

³⁵ James Thayer Addison, *The Episcopal Church in the United States, 1789-1931* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 198.

Episcopal Church in the Confederate States of America,"³⁶ wrote in regard to Presiding Bishop Hopkins' efforts:

"The saintly bishop of Vermont availed himself of his position of seniority to send a letter to each of the Southern bishops, in which he testified his own 'affectionate attachment,' and assured his brethren of the 'cordial welcome' awaiting them at the approaching General Convention. 'I trust,' he said, 'that I shall enjoy the precious gratification of seeing you and your delegates in proper place at the regular triennial meeting.'"³⁷

The Presiding Bishop's efforts bore fruit, and in due time unification was effected. The General Conventions of 1862 and 1865, which met while Bishop Hopkins presided over the House of Bishops, were so concerned with national and internal issues that they made no changes in the duties and powers of the Presiding Bishop. But the incumbent, like his predecessor Bishop White, fulfilled the office of a mediator well, and showed that the Presiding Bishop was not only an official of the Church, but also an unofficial *liaison* and a person of great influence.

Second Period

Presiding Bishop Hopkins' successor was the Right Rev. Dr. Benjamin Bosworth Smith, Bishop of Kentucky, who had already presided over the House of Bishops in 1866 in Bishop Hopkins' absence. Bishop Smith became Presiding Bishop on January 9, 1868, at the age of seventy-four, and it was during his term of office that the second period of development began. The Presiding Bishop ceased to be in the eyes of the Church primarily the Presiding Bishop of the House of Bishops. He was also, no matter how poorly defined his duties, the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

This was made clear in a very practical way at the General Convention of 1871 when the House of Deputies (which alone could legislate on this matter) passed a resolution instructing the treasurer of the General Convention "to reserve five hundred dollars, to be subject to the call of the Presiding Bishop of the House of Bishops, for the payment of such expenses as may be incurred by him in the discharge of his duties incident to his office during the next three years."³⁸ It also instructed the treasurer to pay the Presiding Bishop five hundred dollars to reimburse him for expenses incurred by him since his entrance upon

³⁶ See *Historical Magazine*, XVII (1948), p. 333.

³⁷ *Loc. cit.*

³⁸ 1871 *Journal*, p. 79.

the duties of that office.³⁹ Although this was by no means the payment of a salary, this action was an acknowledgement that the Church as a whole had a responsibility for the expense account of its Presiding Bishop. Prior to this, each diocese which asked the Presiding Bishop to consecrate its bishop-elect paid his expenses on that particular occasion.

Bishop Smith was the first Presiding Bishop since Bishop Provoost to live in New York. He lived in New York as a matter of health and convenience, but retained his position as Bishop of Kentucky, letting his coadjutor do most of the work. This was at least the beginning of the trend towards locating the residence of the Presiding Bishop in a metropolitan area where he could more efficiently fulfill the duties of his office.

At the General Convention of 1874, a rather far-sighted canon was proposed which did not get any farther than the committee on canons. The gist of the canon was that the senior bishop, on becoming Presiding Bishop, or at any time thereafter, would have the right of resigning his jurisdiction, and then receiving a salary from "the General Church" while he devoted himself solely to the work of the Presiding Bishop.⁴⁰ The method of securing the salary and a place of residence for the Presiding Bishop was worked out in detail in the proposed canon. Although this canon was not adopted, it was an indication that others besides the various Presiding Bishops themselves were aware that the work devolving upon the senior bishop by virtue of his office as Presiding Bishop was more than could fairly and justly be expected of a man who was already involved in the fulltime responsibility of serving as bishop of his own diocese.

Because this proposed canon and several other proposed canons were not passed at this Convention of 1874, a committee was set up to study the whole subject of the office of Presiding Bishop. This was another indication that the Church recognized it as the office of one who was head of the Church as well as the president of the House of Bishops. This committee merely recommended that the expenses of the Presiding Bishop be paid by the Church, as has been mentioned earlier.⁴¹

The 1874 Convention amended the canons dealing with the Abandonment of the Communion of this Church by a Bishop. The canon then said that if such a bishop failed to avail himself of the provisions of the canon, the Standing Committee of the diocese of said bishop was required

³⁹ *Loc. cit.*

⁴⁰ *1874 Journal*, p. 40.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 311.

"to make a certificate of the fact to the Presiding Bishop, together with a statement of the acts or declarations which proves such abandonment, which certificate shall be recorded by the Presiding Bishop, and the Presiding Bishop, with the consent of the three Bishops next in seniority, may then suspend said Bishop from the exercise of his office and ministry until such time as the House of Bishops shall consent or refuse to consent to his deposition."⁴²

The canon provided that if the bishop did not deny the alleged facts within six months, it was required that the Presiding Bishop "convene the House of Bishops . . . and if [the Bishops] give their consent, the Presiding Bishop shall proceed to depose from the Ministry the Bishop so certified as abandoning, and to pronounce and record, in the presence of two or more Bishops, that he has been so deposed."⁴³ Another duty of the Presiding Bishop concerning the episcopate was thus added to his office.

Two more duties were given to the Presiding Bishop by the General Convention of 1883. He was required to notify any bishop-elect of the consent of the House of Bishops to his consecration, and he was *required* to take order for the consecration of that bishop-elect.⁴⁴ These matters had usually been handled by the Presiding Bishop as a routine matter, but by passing this canon, Convention made such action mandatory on the Presiding Bishop.

Presiding Bishop Smith, who was very feeble in his latter days, died on May 31, 1884. He had been a bishop for over fifty-one years. Although his responsibilities as Presiding Bishop had not been greatly increased during his term, he had at least been paid for his expenses as Presiding Bishop by the whole Church, and his experience had made it clear that the work of the office was too burdensome for any man who also had to retain his diocesan responsibility.

The Right Rev. Dr. Alfred Lee, Bishop of Delaware, at the age of seventy-six, succeeded Bishop Smith as Presiding Bishop, and held office only three years. As such he presided over the House of Bishops only once, at the General Convention of 1886. This Convention did not add any responsibilities to the office of Presiding Bishop. Bishop Lee died on April 12, 1887, and was succeeded by the Right Rev. Dr. John Williams, Bishop of Connecticut, who was only sixty-nine when he became Presiding Bishop.

Like several of his predecessors, Bishop Williams felt that making

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 275.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 275, 103.

⁴⁴ 1883 *Journal*, p. 62.

the senior bishop the Presiding Bishop was unfair to both the bishop and the Church. On October 27, 1887, at a special meeting of the House of Bishops, he expressed formally his ideas on this "important subject."⁴⁵ He said: "The conviction has long been growing upon me, that our existing arrangement in regard to the presidency of the House of Bishops is, for many reasons, an undesirable one. The position in which I find myself today strengthens that conviction and changes belief to certainty."⁴⁶

With great diplomacy, Bishop Williams pointed out that "it is only the wonderful growth and expansion of the Church, and the consequent increase in the duties pertaining to the presidency of this House, that would warrant any attempt to change the method and order of a century."⁴⁷ Thus growth and expansion of the Church had increased the duties falling upon the Presiding Bishop, and the office was becoming an increasingly heavy burden on successive incumbents. Bishop Williams believed that to lay the burden of the Presiding Bishopric "on the shoulders of the oldest Bishop of this House, one likely to be the oldest in years as well as by consecration, is surely something which would not be thought of in parallel cases in political, judicial, or business arrangements." Bishop Williams concluded his address by labeling the existing century-old system as "not only unwise, but almost cruel."⁴⁸

A committee of five bishops was appointed to consider Bishop Williams' statement and to report at the next meeting.

At the same special meeting of the House of Bishops at which Bishop Williams made his address, "the Clerk of the Council" was "affectionately requested" to render such assistance to the Presiding Bishop in the matters of communicating with Standing Committees, taking order for consecrations, and the like, as the Presiding Bishop might desire, thereby providing secretarial assistance for the Presiding Bishop.

The Bishop of New York announced that a room had been reserved in the See House, New York, for the use of the Presiding Bishop, the clerk of the Council, and the secretary of the House of Bishops. This generous offer was accepted, and the Presiding Bishop was thereby given a place from which he could exercise his clerical duties as Presiding Bishop besides his own diocesan office.

At the General Convention of 1889, the five bishops who had been

⁴⁵ 1889 *Journal*, p. 538.

⁴⁶ *Loc. cit.*

⁴⁷ *Loc. cit.*

⁴⁸ *Loc. cit.*

appointed to a "Special Committee on the Office of Presiding Bishop" at the special meeting of 1887, reported to the House of Bishops. In their report they proposed a rule of order, which, in effect, would relieve the Presiding Bishop from presiding over the House of Bishops, if he so desired, but would leave him "to conduct all official correspondence with foreign Churches and other bodies, take order for all consecrations, and appoint all committees. . . ." The result was that provision was made by the House of Bishops for the election of a "Chairman" of that House for each specific session. Even this relief raised some questions, however, as to whether or not the canons would have to be amended.

The answer to this question was made by the Right Rev. Dr. Daniel Sylvester Tuttle, Bishop of Missouri, and chairman of the committee on canons, who reported:

"The Committee on Canons, to whom was referred a resolution of inquiry offered by the Bishop of Albany, whether any changes are necessary in the Canons relating to the Presiding Bishop because of the adoption of a Rule of Order appointing a Chairman of the House, respectfully report that they have examined the Canons in which reference is made to the office and duties of a Presiding Bishop, and find no changes are necessary or expedient."⁴⁹

This apparently insignificant action, involving no canonical change, really showed that what was once the sole responsibility of the Presiding Bishop, i.e., presiding over the House of Bishops, was in effect a mere detail which any bishop as chairman could handle. But it also indicated that the office of Presiding Bishop was primarily that of head of a national Church.

Third Period

The third period of development of the office of Presiding Bishop began during the term of office of Dr. John Williams, who, for all practical purposes, can truly be called the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. At the General Convention of 1889, the House of Bishop elected a chairman of the House of Bishops who was also assessor to the Presiding Bishop, and who could, in his absence, or at his request, preside over the House. The Presiding Bishop might also assign any duties connected with his office, from which, from time to time, he might desire to be relieved, to the assessor.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ 1889 *Journal*, p. 33.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

The General Convention of 1898 added two more duties to the office of Presiding Bishop. The main one was his duty to receive annual reports from the missionary bishops about their work and their jurisdiction, etc., and to transmit these reports to the Board of Managers, formerly called the Board of Missions.⁵¹ The Presiding Bishop was given authority to fill the vacancy of the Custodian of the Standard Book of Common Prayer, if there should be a vacancy, until the next General Convention.⁵²

Bishop Williams died shortly after he was given these added responsibilities, and he was succeeded by the Right Rev. Dr. Thomas March Clark, Bishop of Rhode Island, on February 7, 1899. Bishop Clark was eighty-six years old when he became Presiding Bishop, and he was never able to preside over the House of Bishops because of his advanced age and weakened physical condition. But he exerted a good deal of thought on the subject of the nature of the office he held, and during his incumbency the first *official* acknowledgement was made of the fact that the senior bishop was "the Presiding Bishop of the Church."

Bishop Clark had summoned a special meeting of the House of Bishops to be held in St. Louis in October, 1899, nine months after he had become Presiding Bishop. The chairman of the House, the Bishop of Minnesota, Dr. Henry Benjamin Whipple, presided and laid before the House a communication from Presiding Bishop Clark, which said:

"My age and infirmities will not allow me to be present with you at your present session in St. Louis, and I can only say that I have discharged, to the best of my ability, the duties which in the Providence of God have devolved upon me as Presiding Bishop."⁵³

At this same meeting, a resolution was adopted "that the Presiding Bishop be requested to take charge of the Church's work in the Hawaiian Islands as soon as the Archbishop of Canterbury shall communicate to him the resignation of the [Anglican] Bishop of Honolulu."⁵⁴ This was an indication that the Presiding Bishop was regarded as Chief Missionary in charge of the overseas missionary work of the Church at this time.

In April, 1900, another special meeting of the Bishops was held. Presiding Bishop Clark was absent from this meeting also, and the

⁵¹ 1898 *Journal*, p. 167.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 85 of the Canons.

⁵³ 1901 *Journal*, p. 379.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 381.

Bishop of Minnesota, being the senior bishop present, presided.⁵⁵ The Presiding Bishop was also absent from the General Convention of 1901, meeting in San Francisco. In his report to the House of Bishops at this Convention, he said:

May I be allowed, in conclusion, to suggest to the House that there is an indefiniteness in the nature and character of the office of Presiding Bishop, which not infrequently has occasioned me some embarrassment.

For the most part, the work to be discharged is simply perfunctory, but there are certain important things which the Presiding Bishop is required to do which call for the exercise of careful judgment and great discretion.

Among these may be mentioned the appointment of Bishops to have the oversight of our Churches in Europe, Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippine Islands, and other outlying districts, and the appointment of Bishops to take charge of Missionary Districts in the event of the death of the incumbent. It still further devolves upon him to designate, on his own motion, the place of meeting for the General Convention when an emergency arises which makes it impossible to meet in the place originally selected.

To leave such important affairs as these to the sole discretion of an aged man, who may not be competent to exercise proper judgment in matters of importance, seems to me unwise; and I trust that the House of Bishops will take into consideration making the office of Presiding Bishop elective, instead of leaving it to be determined by the simple fact of seniority.

As there is nowhere to be found any general statement whatever of the duties pertaining to the office, and as it requires a careful examination of the Canons in order to ascertain just what it is that the Presiding Bishop is called upon to do, may I be allowed to suggest that some statement should be set forth clearly defining the function and duties of the office?⁵⁶

Whereas Bishop Clark's predecessors had emphasized the inability of many of the incumbents of the office of Presiding Bishop to fulfill their duties because of age and infirmity, Bishop Clark stressed instead the importance of the office and its gradually increasing responsibilities.

The House of Bishops was challenged by Presiding Bishop Clark's expression of concern, and it attempted to deal with this subject. It was "respectfully suggested" in Report No. I of the committee on canons that the following rule be adopted:

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 384-5.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

The House of Bishops, by a vote of a majority of the Bishops entitled to vote in said House, shall elect one of the Bishops having jurisdiction within the United States to be the Presiding Bishop of the Church.

At last in canonical language this fact had been set forth—that the Presiding Bishop was indeed *the Presiding Bishop of the Church*. The report continued:

The Presiding Bishop shall discharge such duties as may be prescribed by the Constitution and Canons of the General Convention. He shall hold office until he becomes seventy years of age, unless before that time he shall resign, or be relieved of that office by a vote of the majority of the Bishops entitled to vote in the House of Bishops.⁵⁷

This report indicated that the Church realized that the office of Presiding Bishop should be filled by a man who had the confidence of his colleagues, who was relatively young, and who was chosen specifically to be the Presiding Bishop of the Church.

Debate over the length of office, how many terms one would be eligible to serve,⁵⁸ the maximum age at which a bishop could be elected Presiding Bishop, ensued.⁵⁹ At length, the House of Bishops adopted a resolution which proposed that the House of Bishops elect, subject to confirmation by the House of Deputies, a Presiding Bishop for a term of three years.⁶⁰ The House of Deputies did not concur, but offered a substitute resolution. After considerable discussion, both Houses adopted this proposed amendment to the constitution:

"The House of Bishops, by a vote of a majority of all the Bishops entitled to a seat in the said House, shall elect one of the Bishops having jurisdiction within the United States, to be nominated for confirmation by the House of Deputies to be the Presiding Bishop of the Church. The Presiding Bishop shall hold office for three years."⁶¹

For this to become a part of the constitution, it had to be passed again by the General Convention of 1904. Since Convention failed to ratify this action in 1904, the old method of making the senior bishop the Presiding Bishop continued in effect.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 263.

Consequently, on the death of Bishop Clark, September 7, 1903, the Right Rev. Dr. Daniel Sylvester Tuttle, Bishop of Missouri, became Presiding Bishop. This was during the discussion over the question as to whether or not the office of Presiding Bishop should be an elective position. All the proposals, of course, provided that any change in the old procedure would take place only upon the expiration of the term of office of Presiding Bishop Tuttle.

Despite the fact that his position as Presiding Bishop was secure, Bishop Tuttle took a view quite unlike that of his predecessors. In discussing this subject, he wrote:

Under the existing constitution God's Providence directly and without man's agency makes the Presiding Bishop. He is the senior bishop in the order of consecration, having jurisdiction within the United States. The death of the preceding senior invests him with the office of Presiding Bishop; and death is God's messenger alone. The solemnity of his appointment to office by the act of God is unspeakably great. . . .

But the proposed change [before General Convention] has in view the making of the Presiding Bishop into a great executive, to be invested with the authority and to be deputed to wield the powers of the whole Church. This would be a new departure. Danger lurks along the line of its development. . . . The proposed change looks to the introducing of a monarchical plan for our national Church which in time might take on a Hildebrandine touch and tone.⁶²

General Convention, however, was not as suspicious as Bishop Tuttle over the plan to change the procedure of selection of the Presiding Bishop. At the 1904 Convention, a committee of three bishops, three presbyters, and three laymen was appointed to consider the matter of the election of a Presiding Bishop, and instructed to report to the General Convention at its next triennial meeting.

The General Convention of 1901 had authorized the Presiding Bishop to declare certain episcopal elections null and void if sufficient consents of bishops and standing committees had not been received by a certain date, and to receive resignations of bishops along with reasons for the same.⁶³ The Convention of 1904 authorized the Presiding Bishop to appoint some other bishop to be in charge of a missionary district until the vacancy was filled.⁶⁴ These were new duties dealing specifically with the episcopate. Another such duty, given to the Presiding Bishop by

⁶² *The Churchman*, CVIII, No. 8, p. 243.

⁶³ See the 1901 *Journal*.

⁶⁴ 1904 *Journal*, pp. 45-46, Canon 10.

the Convention of 1904, was that of pronouncing the sentence of deposition of a Bishop.⁶⁵ After pronouncing said sentence, the Presiding Bishop was required to give notice in the case of the suspension or deposition of a bishop to all archbishops, metropolitans, and presiding bishops in communion with this Church.⁶⁶ The Presiding Bishop was required also to give notice to the secretary of the House of Bishops of the altered status and style of any member of the House of Bishops, due to resignation, deposition, suspension, etc.⁶⁷ This Convention also dealt with the question as to who was in charge at a consecration of a bishop, legislating that all particulars in the service at the consecration of a bishop should be under the direction of the *bishop presiding at the consecration*.⁶⁸

At the General Convention of 1907, the committee which had been appointed in 1904 to consider the matter of the election of a Presiding Bishop, made its report and proposed an amendment to the constitution, to the effect that upon the expiration of the term of office of the present Presiding Bishop (Bishop Tuttle)

"the General Convention by concurrent vote of the majority of all the Bishops entitled to vote in the House of Bishops, and by a majority of all the Dioceses entitled to representation in the House of Deputies, shall elect one of the Bishops having jurisdiction within the United States to be Presiding Bishop of the Church."⁶⁹

This proposal also provided that "upon his [the new Presiding Bishop's] acceptance of the office of Presiding Bishop, the Diocese of which he is the Bishop may elect a Bishop Coadjutor."⁷⁰ A Presiding Bishop thus elected should "hold office during life, until he becomes seventy years of age—unless before that time he shall resign . . . or be relieved of his office by the Houses of Bishops and Deputies, if in the judgment of the General Convention he becomes disqualified by reason of infirmity, or other cause."⁷¹ This proposal was hardly worded in the most discreet way!

After various amendments were proposed, the House of Deputies adopted a resolution to change the constitution in such a way that a

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 84, Canon 28, VI.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 79, Canon 26, VII, ii.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 52, Canon 12, VIII, iii.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 40, Canon 9, I, ii.

⁶⁹ 1907 *Journal*, p. 220.

⁷⁰ *Loc. cit.*

⁷¹ *Loc. cit.*

bishop elected by the House of Bishops would be the Presiding Bishop, subject to confirmation by the House of Deputies. He could also be relieved of his office by action of the General Convention. The House of Bishops concurred, but adopted an amendment stipulating that the Presiding Bishop was to hold office only for six years, unless he became seventy years of age before his six-year term expired, and, in such case, he was to retire at the age of seventy.

At the General Convention of 1910, the House of Bishops failed to ratify the action of the 1907 Convention, as was necessary for it to become a part of the constitution, and the amendment proposing the election of the Presiding Bishop failed. The failure was due to certain details of the amendment rather than to the main purpose, which the House of Bishops did not see fit to approve. The House of Bishops made another attempt, proposing an amendment which left the term and tenure of office of the Presiding Bishop to be decided by the canons rather than by the constitution. The main objective in all of this legislation was to make the office of Presiding Bishop an elective position, rather than a position in which the senior bishop of the Church automatically found himself upon the death of his immediate predecessor.

The amendment which was passed in 1910 failed to pass again at the General Convention of 1913. The 1913 Convention required the Presiding Bishop to declare certain elections null and void; this made mandatory what the 1901 Convention had made possible for the Presiding Bishop to do.

This pattern was broken in 1916, however, and both Houses concurred in adopting an amendment providing for the election of a Presiding Bishop. It was, of course, necessary for the next General Convention to approve this action before the amendment could become a part of the constitution.

The 1919 General Convention will go down in history as one that revolutionized the Church. Considerable canonical legislation was enacted by this General Convention, and some of it dealt with the office of Presiding Bishop. The amendment which was passed in 1916, providing for the election of a Presiding Bishop, was finally adopted. The constitution, thus amended, read:

"Upon the expiration of the term of office of the Presiding Bishop, the General Convention shall elect the Presiding Bishop of the Church. The House of Bishops shall choose one of the Bishops having jurisdiction within the United States to be the Presiding Bishop of the Church by a vote of a majority of all the Bishops entitled to vote in the House of Bishops, such choice to be subject to confirmation by the House of Deputies. His term and tenure of office and

duties shall be prescribed by the Canons of the General Convention."⁷²

Dr. Barnes, the present secretary of the House of Deputies and of the General Convention, in discussing this amendment providing for the election of the Presiding Bishop, said:

"Since the matter involved a change in the constitution, it required identical action by both houses in two consecutive Conventions. While there was no disagreement between the houses on the intrinsic merits of the proposal, differences of opinion as to the details had seemed to develop triennially. Hence the constitutional amendment which had eventually passed both houses in 1916 came before the 1919 Convention for ratification. The House of Deputies acted favorably on the second and the other house on the fourth day, thus settling one of the most important matters before the Convention. It failed to attract any great attention merely because the issue was no longer a matter of argument."⁷³

It remained for this and subsequent Conventions to define the term, tenure, and duties of the Presiding Bishop. A definitive canon was passed by both Houses at the 1919 Convention. It stated:

I. The Presiding Bishop, when elected according to the provisions of Article I, Section 3, of the Constitution, shall hold office for a term of six years.

II. The Presiding Bishop shall preside over meetings of the House of Bishops, and shall take order for the consecration of Bishops when duly elected; and he shall be the executive head of all departments of the Church's work, including those of Missions and Church Extension, of Religious Education, and of Christian Social Service. He shall also perform all other duties prescribed for him by other Canons of the General Convention.

III. The stipend of the Presiding Bishop and his necessary expenses shall be provided for in the budget approved by the General Convention.⁷⁴

At last the object had been achieved which Bishop Clark had proposed two decades before—the Presiding Bishop was to be elected.

The Presiding Bishop's duties were also made the duties of the President of the National Council. This resulted in coordination of different departments of the Church's work, and united them under one organization, of which the Presiding Bishop was to be the chief executive, the actual as well as the nominal head.

⁷² See Article I, Section 3, in the *1919 Journal*.

⁷³ See Barnes, *op. cit.*, pp. 242-3.

⁷⁴ See Canon 16 in the *1919 Journal*.

The Convention of 1919 gave to the Presiding Bishop and the National Council the care of domestic and foreign missions. They were to unify, develop and prosecute the work of missions, Church extension, religious education, and Christian social service, as committed to them by General Convention. They were to initiate and develop new work between the sessions of General Convention as they deemed necessary, subject, however, to the provisions of the constitution and canons and other directions of the General Convention. The Presiding Bishop and the National Council were thus provided with many powers to further the Church's missionary and promotional work. All of this helped centralize and make more efficient the administration and work of the Episcopal Church in its National and overseas aspects, led by its Presiding Bishop. This pattern was quickly followed by most dioceses for the better administration of missions, Christian education, and Christian social relations on a diocesan level.

The host of the General Convention, the Right Rev. Dr. Charles David Williams, Bishop of Michigan, said of it: "The General Convention of 1919 will stand out as one of the most significant in the history of the Church, fine in its spirit, remarkable in its accomplishment."⁷⁵ Certainly the action of Convention in amending the constitution so that the office of Presiding Bishop became an elective office, was one of the most significant acts of the General Convention of 1919. Dr. Barnes, in appraising this Convention, has said:

"The General Convention of 1919 has definitely taken its place as the most important held in this century and as one of the most important ever held."⁷⁶

The Convention of 1922 made it mandatory for the Presiding Bishop to appoint, subject to confirmation by the National Council, a Vice President, to be, in effect, an Assistant to the Presiding Bishop. The Presiding Bishop was also given power to appoint, also subject to confirmation by the Council, an executive secretary for each department, whom he could also discharge at will.

Presiding Bishop Tuttle died on April 17, 1923, and was succeeded by the senior bishop, the Right Rev. Dr. Alexander Charles Garrett, Bishop of Dallas, at the age of ninety-one, who held office until his death eight months later. He was succeeded by the Right Rev. Dr. Ethelbert Talbot, Bishop of Bethlehem. Although the constitutional amendments and canons providing for the election of a Presiding Bishop had already been passed before Bishop Tuttle's death, no election

⁷⁵ Diocese of Michigan, *Journal of Convention*, 1920, p. 86.

⁷⁶ *Historical Magazine*, "The General Convention of 1919," XXI (1952), p. 250.

could be held until General Convention was in session. Hence, Bishop Garrett and Talbot served in the office until the election of a Presiding Bishop could be held during a session of the General Convention. While Bishop Talbot was Presiding Bishop, he was given authority to take order for the payment of the necessary charges and expenses of the Church advocate and board of inquiry who had served in connection with the trial of a bishop.

At the General Convention of 1925, a report was made by the committee which considered the question of the election of a Presiding Bishop. In this report, the duties of the Presiding Bishop were codified for the first time, and presented for the edification of the Convention and the Church. The report showed that in 1925 the Presiding Bishop must be a bishop having jurisdiction within the United States.⁷⁷ The report stated that if he were to resign his jurisdiction, he would cease to be the Presiding Bishop. His term of office was six years. No stipulation was made one way or the other about reelection. He was to preside over meetings of the House of Bishops, reclaiming duties which for thirty-five or forty years had been performed by the chairman of the House. He was to take order for the consecration of bishops when duly elected. He was to be the executive and administrative head of the missionary, educational, and social work of the Church, with the aid of the National Council. He was to receive an annual report from each missionary bishop of his proceedings and of the state and condition of the Church within his missionary district. He was to approve of alterations in the canons of missionary districts. He was to take charge of any vacant missionary district and to appoint a bishop to act in his place. He was to make provision for the episcopal care of congregations in foreign lands. He was to communicate with the heads of Churches in communion with the Episcopal Church as to the establishment of new foreign missionary districts, and to notify such officials of any sentence of suspension or deposition of a bishop. In the case of a trial of a bishop, the charges were to be first presented to the Presiding Bishop, and in the end, if the trial court found him guilty, the Presiding Bishop was to pronounce sentence.⁷⁸

Cautiously, the report pointed out that "there is no hint of there being given to the Presiding Bishop, such as seem to be feared by some, any archiepiscopal powers, authorizing any interference in the internal affairs of a diocese."⁷⁹ In its exposition of these duties, the report em-

⁷⁷ 1925 *Journal*, p. 27.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 27-8.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

phasized that the Presiding Bishop was not only charged with canonical relations with other Churches and Communion, but that out of these grew "necessarily [and] inevitably a greater number of responsibilities affecting other than canonical relations." By way of illustration, the report indicated that the Presiding Bishop would appoint delegates to conferences. He would represent the Church in the religious world upon many occasions and in connection with many movements. The report said that the Presiding Bishop would be, "to borrow the language of the state, the minister of Foreign Affairs."⁸⁰ He was also responsible for the missionary work of the Church, and the handling of problems involving that work. The committee, in discussing the question as to whether the office of Presiding Bishop and that of President of the National Council should be separate offices, said:

"Your Committee believes that an immense opportunity is opened to the Church to give and to follow a farsighted unifying spiritual leadership. Administrative duties of the more technical and specialized kind may be largely devolved upon others, but thought for the whole Church, responsibility for the realizing of the Church's unity, and guidance of its great policies of work should rest in the Presiding Bishop himself."⁸¹

The committee was much concerned over the question as to who would be the Presiding Bishop's successor in event of death. The report proposed that the chairman of the House of Bishops, rather than the senior bishop in point of consecration, should be the automatic successor until the next General Convention when an election could be held.⁸²

In conclusion, the committee emphasized

"the importance of the opportunity which is now offered the Church. However great the demand may be for administrative and executive capacity in the office [of Presiding Bishop] its supreme capacity is spiritual. To interpret the Church's growing consciousness of her unity and of her mission to the world, to interpret it to both the Church and the world, to lead and inspire, to carry confidence and faith and develop devotion and loyalty, your Committee believes that such is the chief responsibility which will rest upon the Presiding Bishop. The responsibility which, therefore, rests upon this house [of Bishops] is proportionately great."⁸³

Legislation proposing that the chairman of the House of Bishops rather than the senior bishop should succeed the Presiding Bishop in

⁸⁰ *Loc. cit.*

⁸¹ *Loc. cit.*

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁸³ *Loc. cit.*

the event of his death did not get any farther than the committee on Amendments to the Constitution which reported:

"Your Committee is of the opinion that the proposed amendment is impossible until the House [of Bishops] determines definitely whether the Chairmanship of this House is to be a permanent office. And the Committee further points to the difficulty of such a Constitutional proceeding dependent upon action provided for only by the Rules of Order of this House."⁸⁴

Agitation was made to allow a bishop coadjutor to be nominated for the office of Presiding Bishop, but this was deemed inappropriate at the time.⁸⁵

The 1925 Convention amended the Canon "Of the Presiding Bishop," making the first day of January succeeding the General Convention at which he was elected, the date he would assume office.

A provision was made at this Convention for the election of an Assessor to the Presiding Bishop. The rules of order stated: "The Presiding Bishop may assign to him [the Assessor] any duties connected with his office from which, from time to time, he may desire to be relieved."⁸⁶

On October 14, 1925, the House of Bishops chose the Right Rev. Dr. John Gardner Murray, Bishop of Maryland, as Presiding Bishop, and the House of Deputies confirmed this action. Accordingly, on January 1, 1926, Bishop Murray became the first Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America to be elected by the General Convention. The diocese of Maryland elected a coadjutor to relieve Bishop Murray of much diocesan responsibility.

Bishop Murray served as Presiding Bishop until his death on October 3, 1929. The constitution provided that, in the case of the death of the Presiding Bishop, the senior bishop of this Church in the order of consecration, having jurisdiction within the United States, should (unless the date of the next General Convention was within three months) immediately call a special meeting of the House of Bishops, to be held within two months, to elect a bishop having jurisdiction in the United States to be the Presiding Bishop. The bishop so elected was to serve until the next General Convention.⁸⁷

In accordance with the constitution, the senior bishop, the Right Rev. Dr. William Andrew Leonard, Bishop of Ohio, summoned a meeting for November 13, 1929, to elect a successor to Bishop Murray. After

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

⁸⁷ See the 1928 *Journal*.

sixteen ballots, the Right Rev. Dr. Charles Palmerston Anderson, Bishop of Chicago, was elected Presiding Bishop (although his name had not been on any of the previous ballots). Bishop Anderson died on January 30, 1930, having been in office only eleven weeks.

Again Bishop Leonard summoned a special meeting of the House of Bishops. He commented: "It is a strange work of Providence which has required me, as Senior Bishop, to take up the work of the Presiding Bishop's office twice within a period of six months. It is without precedent."⁸⁸

At this meeting, the Right Rev. Dr. James DeWolf Perry, Bishop of Rhode Island, was elected Presiding Bishop on the seventh ballot.⁸⁹ His election was made unanimous by a rising vote. Bishop Perry presided over the House of Bishops at the General Convention of 1931, and this Convention elected him Presiding Bishop for a term of six years. A provision was made at this Convention for the election of an assistant to the Presiding Bishop,

"to whom he may from time to time assign any of his official duties from which he may desire to be relieved; the said assistant, in the case of the resignation or death of the Presiding Bishop, or his disability by reason of infirmity, shall discharge the duties of the office of Presiding Bishop until a successor shall be elected as provided in Article I, Section 3 of the Constitution."⁹⁰

The Right Rev. Dr. Hugh Latimer Bursleson, Bishop of South Dakota, filled this position of Assistant to the Presiding Bishop until his death on August 1, 1933. No successor was named.

The 1931 Convention passed a resolution which provided an opportunity for the Presiding Bishop to bring before Convention information respecting the needs and work of the whole Church. It read:

Whereas, the Presiding Bishop, beyond any other person in our Church, has more accurate information respecting the needs and work of the whole Church; and

Whereas, at present there is no proper opportunity afforded him to bring these matters before the Church during General Convention (but only that he report his official acts); therefore be it

Resolved . . . that following the custom in Diocesan Conventions of providing opportunity to the Bishop to deliver a charge to his co-workers, similar opportunity be provided to the Presiding Bishop in the place of the Convention Sermon at the Opening Service.⁹¹

⁸⁸ 1931 Journal, p. 189.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 194.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 326.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 386.

This was regarded as a forward-looking action.

At the General Convention of 1934, the Presiding Bishop's stipend was fixed at \$12,000 a year, with a maximum annual expense account of \$7,000.⁹² This salary was no longer to be paid from missionary funds, but from the budget of the General Convention.⁹³

At this Convention, it was decided that the Presiding Bishop was to receive the application of alien congregations for episcopal oversight.⁹⁴

Certain amendments to the canons relating to the status and work of the Presiding Bishop were recommended to Convention by the committee on canons of the House of Deputies. One of these stated:

The Presiding Bishop shall be President of the House of Bishops and shall preside over its meetings. He shall take Order for the Consecration of Bishops when duly elected. He shall be official representative of the Church in all communications and dealings with other Churches, religious bodies and organizations throughout the world.

He shall be the Chief Pastor of the Church, with the duty to plan for its future growth and work in the advancement of the Kingdom of God.

He shall visit all parts of the country, bringing to every section a sense of the Church's solidarity, and shall speak for the Church to the great multitudes of the unchurched.

He shall also perform all the duties prescribed for him by other Canons of the General Convention.⁹⁵

The House of Deputies adopted this resolution, presumably indicating thereby their ideal for the Presiding Bishop. The House of Bishops, however, did not concur, and the resolution, therefore, did not become effective. The proposed canon is significant, however, in that it shows what a majority of the clerical and lay deputies of the 1934 Convention desired in the person of their Presiding Bishop.

At this Convention, there was established a "Joint Committee on Status and Work of the Presiding Bishop, to Study all Questions Relating to that Subject and Report to the Convention of 1937."

At the General Convention of 1937, this committee made a very thorough and comprehensive report. The report first acknowledged the fact that great energy and time were required for the fulfilment of the duties of Presiding Bishop. The committee held that the Church had no

⁹² 1934 *Journal*, p. 362.

⁹³ See Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

⁹⁴ See 1934 *Journal*, Canon 55, vi, p. 162.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 199.

right to ask any man to carry the double burden of being Presiding Bishop and diocesan bishop concurrently.

The committee was not satisfied with the ruling that the Presiding Bishop hold office only for a term of six years. It emphasized the necessity of a consistency in attitude and opinion over a period of years, and advocated that the bishop elected Presiding Bishop hold office until he reached seventy years of age.

In discussing the problem of relieving the Presiding Bishop of diocesan responsibilities, the report said:

Two ways are open to us. One method would be to require the diocese from which the Presiding Bishop is chosen, to elect at once a Bishop Coadjutor to whom the Presiding-Bishop elect should be required to delegate a jurisdiction which would relieve him of all but nominal duties in his diocese.

The other method would be the creation of a See for the Presiding Bishop. This could be accomplished either by entering into a concordat with some existing diocese, whereby the right of that diocese to choose its own bishop might be yielded to General Convention; or by the ceding to General Convention by some existing diocese of a small portion of its territory, which could be erected as a separate diocese over which the Presiding Bishop would have jurisdiction. . . .

The Committee is aware that there are those who wish clearer definition in the Constitution of the duties and office of the Presiding Bishop. The Committee doubts the advisability of defining too clearly such duties in a Constitution, which deals with principles rather than with details. At the last Convention [1934] an attempt was made to do this, but the result was not satisfactory and did not commend itself to General Convention. Granted an office of this sort, the men chosen for it will themselves create its tradition.⁹⁶

As would be expected, considerable discussion and attempts to legislate ensued in the House of Bishops concerning the issues raised by the joint committee's report. At length, the canon was amended to read: "When a Diocesan Bishop is elected Presiding Bishop, it shall be his duty to relinquish the administration of his Diocese sufficiently to enable him fully to perform his duties as Presiding Bishop."⁹⁷

Again, as in 1934, the House of Deputies attempted to define more explicitly the duties, office, and work of the Presiding Bishop. The Deputies believed that "the office and work of the Presiding Bishop is first and foremost one of spiritual leadership, and second that of shared responsibility for the government and administration of the Church's temporal concerns."

⁹⁶ 1937 *Journal*, p. 488.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, Canon 17.

The Deputies asserted that "as a spiritual leader, the Presiding Bishop is a witness-in-chief to Christ, missionary of missionaries, first in every forward movement, and Father-in-God to the Bishops. Through him, under proper provision, the Church may make known to the world the Gospel of Christ in application to the problems of the age."

The Deputies also expressed their views concerning the Presiding Bishop as head of the National Council. They said:

"As President of the National Council, the judgment is expressed, that so far as possible, he be relieved of the details of administration, that he may give himself to the larger questions of policy and Church Statesmanship."⁹⁸

This was the ideal the 1937 House of Deputies held up for the Presiding Bishop. The House of Bishops attempted to amplify this statement by amending it, and the Deputies also tried to amend it, but in the end there was no concurrence. But certain ideals for the Presiding Bishop had been clearly expressed, even though they were not enacted into canons.

In discussing the action of the 1937 General Convention, the Rev. Dr. Howard Chandler Robbins, in a sermon delivered in St. Bartholomew's Church, New York, said:

... the definition of the work and status of the Presiding Bishop has been made in what may be called missionary terms. His term of office no longer a six-year term but a life work, limited only by age; the conferring of greater executive powers upon him than have heretofore been centered in any single person; the requirement of him not only of all the time that he can spare from his diocesan obligations but of all the time that the work requires; and the selection of our next Presiding Bishop of one who has actually spent many, many years in missionary service and who from personal experience is acquainted with the needs of the mission fields; These things ... entitle the General Convention of 1937 to the honorable name of a missionary convention.⁹⁹

The former missionary, mentioned by Dr. Robbins, was the Right Rev. Dr. Henry St. George Tucker, Bishop of Virginia, and former Bishop of Kyoto [Japan], who took office as Presiding Bishop on January 1, 1938.

Presiding Bishop Tucker presided over the House of Bishops during the General Convention of 1940. At this Convention, a report was made by a "Joint Commission to Consider the Matter of a See for the Presiding Bishop." This report pointed out that by the canons of this

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 350.

⁹⁹ *General Convention in 1937*, by the Rev. Howard Chandler Robbins, D.D., of the General Theological Seminary, p. 11.

Church, the Presiding Bishop takes charge of the consecration of bishops in this Church; has charge of the congregations in foreign lands; has general oversight of the missionary districts; and is executive head of the National Council, which has charge of the unification, development, and prosecution of the missionary, educational and social work of the Church. The report pointed out further that

"the office of the Presiding Bishop differs definitely from that of the traditional Archbishop in that he has no jurisdiction over other Bishops in matters of faith and order. His duties are more arduous, and his power less hierarchial than those of an Archbishop in the Church of England."¹⁰⁰

The main emphasis of the report was that it was desirable that the Presiding Bishop should not retain jurisdiction in his diocese, which might be thousands of miles from national headquarters, but rather that he should have his seat in proximity to his workshop as Presiding Bishop, where the dignity of his office would be maintained with a minimum of local responsibility.¹⁰¹ This was all part of the movement to locate the Presiding Bishop near the national headquarters of the Church. The 1940 Convention designated the National Cathedral in Washington as the seat of the Presiding Bishop.¹⁰²

At the General Convention of 1943, the final step was taken in the long process of freeing the Presiding Bishop from retaining jurisdiction over a diocese. Both houses of Convention concurred in amending Canon 18 to read:

"Upon the expiration of the term of office of the Presiding Bishop, the Bishop who is elected to succeed him shall tender to the House of Bishops his resignation of his previous jurisdiction, to take effect upon the date of his assuming the office of Presiding Bishop, or not later than six (6) months thereafter."¹⁰³

On January 1, 1944, Presiding Bishop Tucker resigned his position as Bishop of Virginia, and was at last free to devote himself solely to his responsibilities as Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

Conclusion

Thus, the office of Presiding Bishop is one that has grown and developed over many years. The Church began its national life with practically no executive head, and with no central governing power ex-

¹⁰⁰ 1940 *Journal*, p. 515.

¹⁰¹ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁰² 1940 *Journal*, p. 360.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

cept the General Convention. But with the growth of the Church, with its missionary expansion, with the extension of the episcopate, and the resulting increase in duties falling upon the Presiding Bishop, the office began to evolve and to become increasingly important in the life of the Church.

The development was due to many factors, but perhaps the chief one was the growth of the Church. This, in turn, necessitated an increase in the number of bishops, and the compulsory retirement of bishops, with a larger House of Bishops as one result. The growth of the Church and its gradual expansion to the West Coast meant that more and more miles had to be covered by the Presiding Bishop if he were to preside at the consecration of each bishop. Much energy and time was required of the Presiding Bishop to make these trips. More work was increasingly involved in the business of gathering consents for the consecration of bishops.

With the great emphasis in the business world on efficiency and centralization of power, the Church was bound to be influenced to some degree by this trend. The Presiding Bishop has had more and more executive and administrative powers thrust upon him by successive General Conventions. The creation of the National Council meant that the Presiding Bishop has had to devote more and more time to it and its responsibilities.

These and other lesser factors all played a part in the development of the office of Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America as it is today.

Bibliography

[Works quoted in this article]

ADDISON, JAMES THAYER,

The Episcopal Church in the United States, 1789-1931 (New York, 1951).

BARNES, C. RANKIN,

"The Presiding Bishops," in *HISTORICAL MAGAZINE*, XVIII (1949), pp. 97-147; also in *The General Convention: Offices and Officers, 1785-1950* (Philadelphia, Church Historical Society Publication No. 33, 1951), pp. 1-51.

—"The General Convention of 1919," in *HISTORICAL MAGAZINE*, XXI (1952), pp. 224-250.

CHASE, PHILANDER,

Bishop Chase's Address, at the close of the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Cincinnati, Ohio, October 16, A.D., 1850 (Philadelphia, 1850).

The Churchman, Vol. CVIII, No. 8.

GENERAL CONVENTION,

Journals of . . . 1799, 1820, 1823, 1832, 1835, 1841, 1844, 1850, 1853, 1859, 1862,

- 1865, 1871, 1874, 1883, 1889, 1898, 1901, 1904, 1907, 1919, 1925, 1928, 1931, 1934, 1937, 1940, 1943.
- Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 1932 to date (Garrison, N. Y. & New Brunswick, N. J.)
See under BARNES, C. RANKIN; HOPKINS, J. H., III; PENNINGTON, E. L.
- HOPKINS, JOHN HENRY, JR.,
The Life of the Late Right Reverend John Henry Hopkins (New York, 1873).
- HOPKINS, JOHN HENRY, III,
"John Henry Hopkins, First Bishop of Vermont," in *Historical Magazine*, VI (1937), pp. 187-206.
- MANROSS, WILLIAM WILSON,
William White, A Sketch of the First Bishop of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1934).
- MICHIGAN, DIOCESE OF,
Journal of the Convention of . . . 1920.
- NORTON, JOHN N.,
The Life of Bishop Gristwold (New York, 1857).
- PENNINGTON, EDGAR L.,
"The Organization of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States of America," in *Historical Magazine*, XVII (1948), pp. 308-338.
- ROBBINS, HOWARD CHANDLER,
The General Convention in 1937 (A Sermon in the Library of the General Theological Seminary, New York City).
- STONE, JOHN S.,
Memoir of the Life of Bishop Gristwold (Philadelphia, 1844)
- WARD, JULIUS H.,
The Life and Times of Bishop White (New York, 1892).
- WHITE, E. A., and DYKMAN, J. A.,
Annotated Constitution and Canons for the Government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America Adopted in General Conventions, 1789-1952 (Greenwich, Conn., Seabury Press, 2nd Ed., 1954).
- WILLIAMS, JOHN,
Memorial of the Right Reverend John Henry Hopkins (New York, 1868).
- WILSON, BIRD,
The Memoir of the Life of the Right Reverend William White, D.D. (Philadelphia, 1839).

Army Chaplains at Frontier Posts, 1830-1860

By Richard D. Gamble*

RELIGION in its broadest sense has always been a significant part of American life, and at frontier military posts in the mid-nineteenth century it was no less important. The frontier guardsman, while isolated in most instances from familiar institutions of civilization, attempted to maintain as many of life's essentials as possible. The army provided, in addition to clothing, food, and shelter, a framework of government in the Articles of War, a gainful occupation, and medical care. However, it was not until 1838 that provisions were made to include religious and moral instruction as an official part of garrison life. The number of posts authorized for chaplains' service was then limited to twenty by act of Congress, but an important precedent was established to bring the comforts and benefits of religious exercises to isolated military establishments.¹

Through specific legislation in 1791 and 1812, Congress invested itself with the power of appointing chaplains for the army, the navy, and both houses of Congress.² In the 1812 legislation, army chaplains were provided for some troops during the war with England, but when hostilities ended the chaplains were discharged as their units were disbanded. Some states occasionally provided chaplains for their militia units when they were called into federal service for specific emergencies. The General Regulations for the Army for 1825 included a provision for the appointment of chaplains, one for the Department of the East, the other for the Department of the West. However, during the period 1825-1837, only two men received War Department appointments—one for the period of 1825-1827, the other for the years 1828-1837.³

Despite apparent disinterest or apathy in Congress, opportunities

*The author is assistant professor of History, Wisconsin State College, Platteville, Wisconsin.—*Editor's note.*

¹ War Department General Order No. 29, 18 August 1838, Records of United States Army Commands, Department of the West, Letters Received; *see also*, Office of the Chief of Chaplains, *American Army Chaplaincy* (Washington, D. C., 1946), 15f.

² Lorenzo D. Johnson, *Chaplains of the General Government* (New York, 1856), 9.

³ *Ibid.*, 65; *see also*, Office of Chief of Chaplains, *American Army Chaplaincy*, 13f.

for church services and religious instruction were inaugurated at a number of western military establishments. At Fort Snelling in 1821, Colonel Josiah Snelling's wife and daughter held Sunday school in the basement of the colonel's quarters. Every Sunday morning, children from the garrison and neighboring settlements would gather for a brief worship service and Bible stories.⁴ Similarly at Fort Winnebago, Wisconsin, in the early 1830's, Mrs. John Kinzie, bride of the sub-agent to the Winnebagoes, found that neither the garrison nor the nearby settlers had even periodic religious services. Her staunch Congregational background prompted her to hope that someone at the post "... might be found who would read a portion of the church service, and a sermon from our different selections." Her hopes faded for a moment when one person suggested calling upon a particular officer who did own a Bible. Upon closer investigation, Mrs. Kinzie found that the officer was something of an eccentric. He was reported to have lapses of alcoholism and religious zeal, which when combined forced him to his bed where he would wail, flail, and shout scriptural passages until he became sober. Still hopeful, Mrs. Kinzie and other ladies of the garrison often wrote to friends in the East requesting that a missionary be sent to their isolated station for both Indian and white population.⁵

In the spring of 1833, Mrs. Kinzie's aspirations were realized for a short time. The Rev. and Mrs. Kent of Galena, Illinois, visited Fort Winnebago and led the first Protestant church service in the community. The large hospital parlor was used for the occasion, which satisfied almost everyone, especially Mrs. Kinzie, who wrote, "For nearly three years we had lived without the blessing of a public service of praise and thanksgiving. We regarded this commencement as an omen of better times. . . ." After the Kents departed, the ladies' sewing circle increased its endeavors to raise a fund for a permanent missionary.⁶

Although some posts did not have an official chaplain or a comparable lay reader, religious needs were satisfied by clergymen who were sent into the wilderness by missionary societies to preach among "the heathen" Indians. One such clergyman was William M. Ferry, who, with Mrs. Ferry, arrived at Mackinac Island, site of Fort Mackinac, in 1823. They were cordially and enthusiastically welcomed by the com-

⁴ George C. Tanner, "Early Episcopal Churches and Missions in Minnesota," *Collections of the Minnesota State Historical Society*, X (1905), 203.

⁵ (Mrs.) John H. Kinzie, *Wau-Bun—The "Early Day" in the North-West*, edited by Milo M. Quaife (Chicago, 1932), 123f.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 576f.

bined civilian and military communities.⁷ Whenever Mr. Ferry conducted a prayer meeting or church service in the village, many officers and their families would attend. In 1825, Mrs. Ferry wrote to her sister in Ashfield, Massachusetts, that the little band of Christians at Mackinac had increased to seven. Among the group was Mrs. William Hoffman, wife of the commanding officer, who "became hopefully changed through the preaching of Mr. Laird at Sault Ste. Marie [near Fort Brady], [and who] was recently stationed at this post having no previous opportunity to unite with the church. She appears to be a valuable woman."⁸ One might conclude from the latter remark that Mrs. Ferry thought the commanding officer's wife could be valuable in increasing the size of the mission group.

When Fort Mackinac became headquarters for the Fifth Infantry Regiment in 1829, Mrs. Ferry noted happily that a considerable interest was given to the mission's church program. Lieutenant-Colonel Enos Cutler, the new commanding officer, was reputed to have been something of a man of the world, but one who attended church, if the weather were pleasant. Cutler's wife was an invalid and a staunch Episcopalian, and consequently never joined her husband in church. However, the post surgeon, Dr. Richard Saterlee, and a number of other officers attended church regularly with their wives. Single officers, two of whom were allegedly dissipated, attended church infrequently. Most of the enlisted men attended church on Sunday and prayer meetings on weekday evenings. The main attraction seems to have been Mrs. Ferry's comely appearance and beautiful singing voice.⁹ The Ferrys carried on their missionary work at Mackinac until 1834, at which time Mr. Ferry retired from the ministry because of poor health. A monument to his work remained on the island, however. Eight officers contributed a total of \$110 toward building a mission church, which actually was completed before Ferry retired.¹⁰

During his pastoral work at Mackinac, Ferry was assisted by Elisha Loomis, a lay worker for the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Loomis' reports to Jeremiah Evarts, the Board's secretary, indicate that the Mackinac community experienced a concentrated

⁷ Charles A. Anderson (ed.), "Frontier Mackinac Island, 1823-1834, Letters of William Montague and Amanda White Ferry," *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society*, XXV (December, 1947), 199.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 126.

⁹ *Ibid.*, XXVI (June, 1948), 123f.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, XXVI (September, 1948), 191; see also, W. M. Ferry to D. Greene, 5 November 1830, MS. in *Papers of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions*, Houghton Library, Harvard University.

missionary effort. Loomis conducted a Sunday school class in the village, and held regular prayer meetings at the military post for those soldiers who wished to attend. During 1830, he was pleased to find that about twenty-five men attended regularly. While the gathering appears to be small, it represented about twenty percent of the aggregate strength at Fort Mackinac at the time.¹¹

A similar condition existed at Fort Howard, near Green Bay, Wisconsin, where the Rev. Cutting Marsh extended his Indian missionary work to include the military post. In the summer of 1831, Marsh reported to the home office that he was losing his military congregation, many of whom were being transferred to Fort Winnebago, but that he expected a new group among the troops being sent from Fort Dearborn. Marsh anticipated something of a challenge in dealing with new troops, especially in the atmosphere of competition which existed with nearby Episcopal and Roman Catholic missionary establishments. Significantly, the post surgeon, a Dr. Lyman Foot, appeared to be a most loyal and staunch supporter of organized religion in the area. However, when Dr. Foot was transferred to Jefferson Barrocks, Marsh expected that the surgeon's successor, Dr. Clement A. Finley, while "not a professor of religion," would offer the mission comparable leadership and support through "religion by experience."¹²

In the autumn of 1831, the Rev. Jeremiah Porter, having served as assistant to Mr. William Ferry at Mackinac Island, arrived at Sault Ste. Marie near Fort Brady. While Porter's primary task was operating a Presbyterian mission station for civilian and Indian population, he frequently offered his services at the garrison. Among the first services that Porter performed was in assisting at the baptism of two soldiers and an Indian woman. Porter recorded in his journal that on Sunday morning, November 27, 1831, he and the Rev. Mr. Boutwell broke the ice in the St. Mary's River to perform the ceremony. Porter further indicated that while the occasion was very impressive, it could have been made more solemn and meaningful had the converts been completely immersed.¹³ During his ministry at Fort Brady, Porter witnessed many conversions and baptisms, among them the commanding officer—a signal victory for any clergyman. Something of the era's intense anti-Catholic feeling is seen in Porter's elation in observing the conversion of several Roman

¹¹ E. Loomis to J. Evarts, 22 January 1831, MS. in *Papers of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions*, Houghton Library, Harvard University; see also, *American State Papers, Military Affairs*, IV, 591.

¹² C. Marsh to D. Greene, 20 July 1831, *ibid.*

¹³ Jeremiah Porter, *Journal of Incidents 1831-33*, 27 November 1831, microfilm copy of MS. in Phillips Collection, Bizzell Library, University of Oklahoma.

Catholic soldiers who had "renounced papacy cordially and entirely as a system of priest-craft and ridiculous mummery."¹⁴ Assisted by the Rev. Mr. Bingham of the nearby Baptist mission station, Porter succeeded in establishing a temperance society within the military post. The clergymen met with the group at least one evening a week, and further encouraged the men to gather on other occasions for prayer and meditation. As a tangible reward for temperance, Porter encouraged the men to establish a savings fund with the money they would ordinarily have used for liquor. Two events touched Porter deeply during his service at Fort Brady. After considerable personal effort through prayer, meditation, and dialectics, Porter found that the wife of one of the lieutenants, a Mrs. Clary, was ready to make a decision to join his particular denomination. The woman's background was what astounded Porter. She had been reared in a Roman Catholic school, but had come from a home wherein her father practiced orthodox Judaism, and her mother followed the precepts of the Society of Friends. The second event involved Sergeant and Mrs. Cooper, who, accompanied by their two children, appeared before Mr. Porter to request that he perform the marriage ceremony. Porter's hands probably trembled until he found that the couple had been united in a civil ceremony by a judge advocate some ten years before. Now their goal was in having their marriage sanctified in a Christian religious service.¹⁵

One of the first missionaries to achieve something close to official status was the Rev. Abel Barber, who arrived at Fort Winnebago during the winter of 1835. Barber's official capacity was in serving the Indians in the region on behalf of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, but he was paid forty dollars a month from the post fund to act as occasional post chaplain. In reporting to the Board's secretary, Barber indicated that he had been received very cordially by Lieutenant-Colonel Enos Cutler and other officers of the Fifth Infantry Regiment, and that every facility had been placed at his disposal to carry out his duties. While the post surgeon, Dr. Charles McDougall, and his wife were the only avowed Presbyterians at the Fort, the doctor had influenced others to volunteer for a course in religious instruction. In addition to regular Sunday services, Barber started a series of weekly prayer groups, a Bible study class, and a temperance society. Unfortunately, an impasse occurred when a number of officers objected to worshipping in common with the enlisted men. Barber would not hear of separate services and consequently packed to leave. Lieutenant-Colonel

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 14 April 1832.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 28 January 1832; 13 February 1832; 20 February 1832.

Cutler sympathized with the cleric's position and urged him to stay. However, after seeing the possible appearance of hypocrisy in acquiescing to the minority's demand, Cutler had to suggest that Barber should retire to a nearby Indian mission and offer the garrison his services for special occasions.¹⁶

Protestant missionaries frequently visited other posts during their circuit riding duties. In almost every case, a substantial number of officers and men would gather for special weekday and Sunday services, and in one case at Fort Snelling hired a full time preacher, around whom they formed their own church group.¹⁷ On rare occasions, a Roman Catholic priest was invited to preach to the troops, such as in Father Charles Van Quackenborne's visit to Fort Leavenworth in 1835. But, such an occurrence was considered unusual inasmuch as the majority of officers, who would be in a position to issue invitations to clergymen, were Protestant. Moreover, during the 1830's, there were many manifestations of anti-Catholic feeling throughout the East.¹⁸

The foregoing examples indicate that the need for religious exercises and spiritual guidance was recognized by many military leaders who were at the time serving on the frontier. In most cases, voluntary ministrations were happily accepted, and in only one or two cases were clergy afforded some sort of official recognition and remuneration. In the meantime, Washington officialdom was not unsympathetic to the problems faced by the frontier soldier. Secretary of War Lewis Cass expressed his concern on the matter in his annual report for 1831 :

The American soldier is well paid, fed and clothed ; and in the event of sickness or disability, ample provision is made for his support. But his moral culture is wholly neglected. There is no arrangement in our service for his mental or religious improvement. And there is perhaps no similar service in which such a measure is more necessary. Many of the positions occupied by our troops are upon the verge of civilization, or beyond it. There they are retained for years, and under circumstances which, if not counteracted, almost necessarily lead to great demoralization. . . . I am satisfied that the appointment of chaplains and their employment at such of our garrisons, may seem to call for such a measure, would be productive of great advantage to the service ; and to the soldiers individually the measure would be equally beneficial.¹⁹

¹⁶ A. Barber to D. Greene, 19 March 1835, MS. in *Papers of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions*.

¹⁷ ———, "Early Days at Fort Snelling," *Collections of the Minnesota State Historical Society*, I (1902), 358f.

¹⁸ Henry Shindler, *Public Worship, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 1827-1907* (Fort Leavenworth, 1907), 2f.; see also, Office of Chief of Chaplains, *American Army Chaplaincy*, 23.

¹⁹ *American State Papers, Military Affairs*, IV, 209.

Again, in 1836, Cass included a statement of interest in his annual report to have Congress act on a proposal to appoint army chaplains. Although, in a number of cases, post councils of administration had hired clergymen on a voluntary basis, no official plan materialized between Cass's first and second reports. However, interest in the project was mounting, especially among the more thoughtful frontier officers.²⁰ From Fort Brady, Michigan, Lieutenant Joseph S. Gallagher wrote to Senator Benjamin Swift (Vermont) to urge the passage of a bill authorizing the appointment of chaplains. In contrast to the army's plight, Gallagher pointed out that the navy had spent over \$10,000 a year for fleet chaplains, and that Congress had appointed chaplains for its own use and for the Military Academy at West Point. Gallagher further cited a case of a clergyman's being employed at Fort Brady, Michigan, after which the number of guard house inmates fell off sharply through good guidance. The lieutenant estimated that willing and competent clergymen could be appointed at an annual salary of \$200 to \$400 each.²¹

A similar appeal was written to Senator John Davis (Massachusetts) by Lieutenant-Colonel Josiah Vose, a seasoned officer, who was then stationed at Fort Towson, Indian Territory:

I have been in the army for nearly twenty-four years, and I am now convinced, from past experience, that nothing will add so much to the respectability and influence of our army as the appointment of chaplains and the regular public worship of God at our military posts on the Sabbath.

It is found that where the Sabbath is properly observed and the public worship is held, that there are fewer desertions, less intoxication, and a more healthy command.

Vose continued by observing further that with compulsory church attendance for officers and enlisted men, and if chaplains were selected carefully on the basis of talent, character, and piety, the moral character of the army would change remarkably. He concluded his letter with the pointed allusion that, since the government had an "overflowing treasury," an expenditure of fifty or sixty thousand dollars a year for the benefit of the common soldier would hardly be a burden. A government which could balance its fiscal accounts and build a treasury surplus through a high tariff and booming land sales might well prepare its soldiers for what Vose called "a better and another world."²²

²⁰ Office of Chief of Chaplains, *American Army Chaplaincy*, 14.

²¹ *American State Papers, Military Affairs*, VI, 119f.

²² *Ibid.*, 148.

On July 5, 1838, Congress finally acted by passing a bill for the appointment of army chaplains. The act was further supplemented by War Department Order 29, which provided that post councils of administration should take steps to employ a chaplain, who in addition to his pastoral duties, would "teach and instruct the children of the private soldier as well as the officer." Further, the chaplain's compensation was set at forty dollars per month with an allowance for four rations per day and the allotment of fuel and quarters comparable to that of a captain. The number of chaplain posts was limited to twenty, which, in the West, included Jefferson Barracks and Forts Brady, Winnebago, Snelling, Leavenworth, Crawford, Gibson, Jesup, and Towson.²³

During the fall of 1838, a number of appointments were made, and among the first was the Rev. Richard Fish Cadle, an Episcopal clergyman who was invited by the post council of administration at Fort Crawford, Wisconsin Territory, to become the post chaplain. Cadle had been serving as missionary in the Prairie du Chien area for a number of years. Other appointments included those of Abel Bingham at Fort Brady, Michigan; Ezekial Gear at Fort Snelling, Iowa Territory; Charles Reighly at Fort Gratiot, Michigan; and Henry Gregory at Fort Leavenworth. The following year, 1839, other chaplains were engaged, including John J. Ungerrer and Charles S. Hodges, successively at Jefferson Barracks, Missouri; Stephen P. Keyes at Fort Winnebago, Wisconsin Territory; David E. Griffith to replace Gregory at Fort Leavenworth, and Henry J. Lamb at Fort Jessup, Louisiana. In 1840, the Rev. William Scull received the chaplain's appointment at Fort Gibson, Cherokee Nation.²⁴

Information more explicit than in the original 1838 War Department order concerning the chaplain's duties was included in the War Department General Regulations in 1841. After the post council had made its selection, a candidate's name was sent through channels for official acknowledgment by the Secretary of War and the Adjutant General. At those posts where a chaplain's service was provided, attendance at Sunday services was made compulsory. It was expected that the chaplain would deliver a short, practical sermon. However, if a post was without a chaplain, then commanding officers were urged to make use of local church facilities. In addition to the compulsory nature of the Sunday services, the men, wearing side arms, were required to march to the chapel in formation. The General Regulations suggested that wives

²³ War Department General Order No. 29, 18 August 1838, Records of United States Army Commands, Department of the West, Letters Received.

²⁴ Johnson, *Chaplains of the General Government*, 66f.

and families too, be encouraged to cooperate by attending church, but without the element of compulsion. Finally, chaplains were instructed to visit the sick periodically, either in the barracks, or with the surgeon's permission at the post hospital. Subsequent editions of the General Regulations in 1847 and 1857 contained substantially the same instructions and regulations for chaplains. In all editions, however, special attention was called to the Second Article of War, wherein it was "earnestly recommended to all officers and soldiers diligently to attend Divine Service."²⁵ Besides the "earnest recommendation," the Second Article of War provided that any officer who was found guilty of indecent or irreverent behavior at church could be court martialed. Any non-commissioned officer, similarly found guilty, would be fined one-sixth of a dollar for his first offense, and for subsequent times be fined the same amount and be confined to quarters for twenty-four hours.²⁶

While the general spirit of observing high moral standards appears to be consistent throughout every Western command, the intensity of observation varied somewhat from one commander to another. On one occasion, Colonel Stephen W. Kearny openly questioned the undemocratic nature of compulsory church attendance in the light of traditional republican religious freedom. In reply to Kearny's question, the Adjutant General's office made it clear that all commanding officers had a right to require troops under their command to attend church on Sunday. Wrote Col. Roger Jones, A. G., "It may be made a part of their military duty, and they could be paraded and marched to the place of worship." At the same time, Jones passed along a view expressed by Lewis Cass, who had championed the movement to provide chaplains for isolated military posts, that as Secretary of War he would feel particularly grieved if he should hear that any portion of the troops should object to attending public worship.²⁷ On the other hand, there was some question as to the meaning and purpose of the Army Regulations for troops at Fort Towson. When Captain Benjamin L. E. Bonneville arrived at the latter post in the spring of 1838, a note from the commanding officer, Lieutenant-Colonel Josiah Vose, informed him that formal inspection was held every Sunday morning at 10:30 a.m., after which preaching was generally heard at 11:00 a.m. Attendance at the first affair was mandatory, but

²⁵ War Department, *General Regulations for the Army of the United States 1841* (Washington, 1841), 34f; ———, *General Regulations . . . 1847*, 54.

²⁶ Alfred Mordecai, (ed.), *A Digest of Laws Relating to the Military Establishment of the United States* (Washington, 1833), 41.

²⁷ Colonel R. Jones to Colonel S. W. Kearny, 3 May 1839, Records of United States Army Commands, Department of the West, Letters Received.

not so for the second event. Vose did point out, however, that no passes were issued on the Sabbath.²⁸

In 1848, a number of new military posts were established in the territory acquired from Mexico; therefore in March, 1849, the 1838 Chaplain Act was amended to authorize the appointment of ten additional chaplains. Moreover, as in the earlier act, the criteria for establishing chaplain posts in the West was still based on the size of the garrison and the degree of isolation from local churches and mission stations.²⁹ In February, 1857, a third act concerning army chaplains was passed by Congress. It provided that the Secretary of War, upon recommendation of the post councils of administration, could sanction a twenty dollar a month salary increase for the chaplains' pay.³⁰ Although the 1849 act increased the number of chaplain posts to thirty, not all openings were filled. For example, in 1857 there were sixteen posts in the Department of the West, ten of which were authorized for chaplain duty, yet only five chaplains were on active duty. The picture was somewhat better in the Department of Texas in that four of the fifteen posts were granted chaplain benefits, and among the four, three full time chaplains were serving. The situation in New Mexico was about the same, with two chaplains serving in a command of fifteen military stations which were allotted three chaplains.³¹

Doubtless, such a state of affairs was considered as normal then as it would seem now. For, just as in the case of a school teacher, a minister could expect only meager remuneration for long years of service, despite personal satisfaction or academic preparation. Even after the chaplain's salary was raised to sixty dollars a month plus rations, fuel, and quarters, his total compensation was still less than that of an infantry captain. An officer could anticipate subsequent promotions which usually involved increases in salary, allowances, and prestige, but not so the chaplain. Moreover, a chaplain, like a parish clergyman, was faced with pleasing the whims and fancies of his coerced congregations, whose attitudes understandably ranged from enthusiasm to indifference and hostility. Furthermore, the normal term of office was only three years, at the end of which time the chaplain had to count on the support and good wishes of the post council of administration for reappointment.³²

²⁸ Lieutenant-Colonel J. Vose to Captain B. L. E. Bonneville, 10 March 1838, Records of United States Army Commands, Fort Towson, Letters Sent, 1838.

²⁹ Johnson, *Chaplains of the General Government*, 29.

³⁰ Office of the Chief of Chaplains, *American Army Chaplaincy*, 20.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 17.

³² *Ibid.*, 21.

What induced civilian clergy to embrace the chaplain's office was no doubt the greater relative security, especially in terms of a regular monthly income. As the ink was drying on the 1838 Chaplain's Act, the Rev. Charles S. Hodges wrote to Bishop Jackson Kemper to request support in finding a new location. He bemoaned the fact that his stipend at Palmyra, Missouri, was not large enough to maintain himself, much less his family. Shortly thereafter, Bishop Kemper aided Hodges in acquiring the position of chaplain at Jefferson Barracks, Missouri, where he was able to serve until troops were withdrawn in 1844.³³

Another insecure cleric in Bishop Kemper's jurisdiction was the Rev. Ezekiel Gear. In a letter to the bishop, Gear indicated some of the reasons he accepted a position as chaplain at Fort Snelling, the furthestmost Western post in 1838:

"The great expense of living and the peculiar propine of the times in Galena [Illinois], the small number of friends of the church, together with the great indifference on the whole subject of religion, have made me in a great degree dependent upon my brother for the support of myself and family during the whole of the time I have been here. This has produced an oblique feeling on the part of his wife, who is the definition of selfishness. This feeling has been fanned and cherished by a maiden sister of her's, one of the most disagreeable specimens of the whole sisterhood."

At the same time, Gear expressed a suspicion that the Bishop of Illinois had been speculating with diocesan funds, and when the day of reckoning came about, Gear indicated that he did not want to be involved in testifying to an investigating body.³⁴

That the problems of tenure and opposition were real is well illustrated in the case of the Rev. William Scull, who was chaplain at Fort Washita from September, 1844, to October, 1847. In the latter year, when Scull applied to the post council of administration for a new appointment, he found that not only the post council but also the commanding officer was opposed to his remaining at the post. Looking for outside help and justification for reappointment, Scull wrote to the department commander, General Mathew Arbuckle, to inform him of the untenable situation at Fort Washita. In summarizing his difficulties, Scull surmised that Major George Andrews, the commanding officer, opposed his reappointment through a belief that all church services, compulsory or otherwise, were too bothersome; that the enlisted men's in-

³³ C. S. Hodges to J. Kemper, 29 August 1838, *Kemper Papers*, MS. Division, The State Historical Society of Wisconsin; see also, Johnson, *Chaplains of the General Government*, 67.

³⁴ E. Gear to J. Kemper, 22 November 1838, *ibid.*

difference probably arose from General Arbuckle's earlier order excusing all Roman Catholics from compulsory church attendance; and that the post council lacked enthusiasm because of poor church facilities. Scull further suggested that a solution might have been found if Major Andrews were ordered to enforce compulsory church attendance according to army regulations, if the general would rescind his order concerning Catholic soldiers, and if post funds were provided to build a church.³⁵

Major Andrews was informed of Scull's dissatisfaction and was provided with a copy of his letter to General Arbuckle. Andrews, thereupon, wrote Arbuckle to justify his own position and to answer some of Scull's complaints. Pointing out that Scull could very well have used the post school building for church services once a week, Andrews indicated that Scull's sermons were much too formal for his personal tastes. Further, Andrews observed that Scull's service was of no benefit to the command because he "has not taken steps to make himself acceptable to the command or the cause of religion." Andrews concluded by recommending that the office of chaplain be abolished at Fort Washita, and with the concurrence of Surgeon William Fullwood, he noted that any one of several missionaries in the vicinity could attend to such religious services as might be needed from time to time.³⁶

Given the opportunity, Scull replied to Andrews' charges and acknowledged that the canons and rubrics of the Episcopal Church were unavoidable, and that Andrews and Fullwood had every right to personal objections concerning the content, length, and presentation of sermons. On the other hand, Scull contended that Major Andrews had manifested a clear and definite opposition to chaplains, and had intimated that he would like to see all chaplain posts removed from the frontier. Moreover, Scull asserted, Andrews' professions had been paradoxical, on one hand "papistical and opposed to all Protestants; secondly, infidel and opposed to Christianity." To support his view, Scull wrote further:

It is but a very recent thing that the men generally have the time to attend public worship. . . . If, however, the commanding officers will shoot game on Sunday before the Chaplain's door, permit men at time of service to walk out of the garrison with their guns to hunt, and the 'nine-pin-alley' to be open, it is impossible for an angel to resist the tide of immorality, and be popular.

As far as making himself acceptable to the command by visiting the men in their quarters, Scull indicated that he would have been very

³⁵ Chaplain W. Scull to General M. Arbuckle, 29 March 1847, Records of United States Army Commands, Department of the West, Letters Received.

³⁶ Major G. Andrews to General M. Arbuckle, 20 April 1847, *ibid*.

willing if the men had so requested him. Inasmuch as women were frequently entertained in the soldiers' rooms, Scull felt that any impromptu visits on his part were out of the question. Finally, Scull pointed out another possible source of irritation between him and Dr. Fullwood. At an earlier time, without notifying the commanding officer or the post surgeon, Scull had reported an alleged case of infanticide at Fort Washita to the commander of the Department of the West.³⁷

Because of the serious nature of the charges and counter charges, and because of the disruption of morale at Fort Washita, General Arbuckle was instructed by the Adjutant General's office to conduct a full investigation and to report findings to Washington. During the summer, additional testimony was gathered, and by fall the story of Scull's misfortune seemed complete. The chaplain had innocently become enmeshed in a military-political feud involving Colonel William S. Harney, a dragoon officer who was in command at Fort Washita from 1834 to 1847, and Major George Andrews, an infantry officer who succeeded Harney. Harney by reputation was an outspoken, opinionated individual, who made sure his position was clearly understood. Andrews, as indicated above, could draw blood with his verbal attacks, and apparently resented being suppressed by a non-Academy senior officer. During the first months of the war with Mexico in 1846, Harney as ranking cavalry officer took violent exception to General Winfield Scott's passing by him to promote other officers. Court martial proceedings were instituted after Harney's harangue against Scott, but Harney appealed to his friend William Marcy, Secretary of War, who reversed the court's command-decision, rebuked Scott, and ordered Harney restored to a command position from which Scott had removed him.

Scull became involved when Harney had personally selected him to be chaplain without consulting other officers at the post; hence, to further discredit Harney, other Fort Washita officers discriminated against Scull. In 1844, during their initial search for a chaplain, the Fort Washita post council of administration had given Bishop George W. Freeman a blank nomination paper on which to suggest a candidate of his acquaintance. While attending an Episcopal convocation in Fayetteville, Arkansas, Bishop Freeman chanced to meet Colonel Harney and laid the problem before him. Out of courtesy to Mr. Scull, who happened to be with the two men when the problem was being discussed, Harney offered Scull the position. When Scull accepted, Harney sent the nomination paper directly to the Adjutant General's office instead of returning it to the post council for its acquiescence.

³⁷ Chaplain W. Scull to General M. Arbuckle, 20 April 1847, *ibid.*

Consequently, when Scull and his family arrived at Fort Washita, they were welcomed by Harney and snubbed by the post council, who did not recognize the appointment as valid. Scull was made to feel more uncomfortable when Major Andrews, chairman of the post council, assigned him care of the post gardens in addition to parochial duties. And as a helper, Scull was given a convicted murderer, who frequently consorted with Major Andrews' negress servant in the post garden. On other occasions, Mr. and Mrs. Scull were ostracized by the post social circle, and were further insulted by Major Andrews' servants. The matter was finally dropped when it was decided that, since Scull was not a commissioned officer, court martial proceedings could not be instituted by or against him. Furthermore, the post council's position was upheld; since they had not sanctioned his first appointment, they were within their rights by refusing to reappoint him.³⁸

When Scull appealed that he had leased his house in Fayetteville for another three-year period and could not legally evict his tenant, the obstinate Andrews hastened Scull's departure with a piece of evidence about Scull's previous chaplain position. Unhappily, some years before, Scull had run from a similar disagreeable situation at Fort Gibson. In May, 1841, Scull was asked by the post adjutant to return to his position at Fort Gibson, where his contract had not expired, or to resign. Scull chose the latter and returned to Indian missionary work in Fayetteville.³⁹

Having dispensed with Scull's services in 1841, the Fort Gibson post council did not consider appointing another chaplain until 1845, at which time they approached the subject with considerable caution. In considering the application of the Rev. Daniel McManus, the council resolved "from time to time to employ Rev. D. McManus, to officiate as Chaplain." Later the resolution was reworded to read, "... to officiate as Chaplain for the period of one year, to be reemployed at the expiration of that time, should the Council of Administration think it proper to do so. . . ." Thus, even though highly recommended by Bishop Freeman, McManus was given only a probationary appointment.⁴⁰ McManus apparently proved to be a satisfactory choice, for he was reappointed and continued to serve until June, 1857. Furthermore, when Congress author-

³⁸ Major W. G. Freeman, A.A.G. to General M. Arbuckle, 22 June 1847 and enclosed replies, *ibid.*; see also, Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone, (eds.) *Dictionary of American Biography* (New York, 1937), VIII, 280f.

³⁹ Chaplain W. Scull to General M. Arbuckle, 1 October 1847 and enclosures, *ibid.*; Major G. Andrews to General M. Arbuckle, 1 October 1847, *ibid.*, Lieutenant S. G. Simmons to W. Scull, 24 May 1841, Records of United States Army Commands, Department Two, Western Division, Letters Sent.

⁴⁰ Post Council of Administration Book, Fort Gibson, 27 May 1845, *ibid.*

ized a salary increase, the Fort Gibson Council resolved to award McManus an extra twenty dollars a month.⁴¹

The sacredness of the post council's power was similarly illustrated in 1860, when Colonel Edwin V. Sumner requested the Secretary of War to remove the Rev. James De Dui from his post at Fort Kearny, Nebraska Territory. Colonel Samuel Cooper, Adjutant General, replied for the War Department, explaining that according to army regulations only the post council of administration had the power to appoint and/or remove a chaplain from his post, and that, regardless of a man's actions or absence from his post, no other means was legal.⁴²

Places of worship varied in proportion to the interest in religious activities at different posts. In 1839, at Fort Snelling there was no chapel *per se*, but a small room in one of the barracks was used for religious purposes for both military and civilian personnel.⁴³ The chapel at Fort Leavenworth was a building which served both as church and recreation room, but was large enough to accommodate most of the command. The Rev. Henry Gregory, Fort Leavenworth's first official chaplain, reported to Bishop Kemper that he was "preaching . . . in an old building occupied by the men as a theatre. Having no windows, and the door open for the admission of light, *it was very cold*. . . . With the 3rd ult. I commenced my duties of school master in a dirty room of the old hospital, with six children. The room is furnished with just two benches and a writing desk and 5/6 of a pair of andirons—nothing more. Surely the government will not complain of our want of economy."⁴⁴ In the 1850's, the chapel at Fort Ripley, Minnesota, was "a simple room decently fixed up, no doubt by the ladies of the garrison, supplemented by the generosity of the officers . . .," wherein a strictly voluntary service was held on Sundays.⁴⁵ At Fort Smith, in 1851, a building of a more permanent nature was erected when the Secretary of War authorized the Rev. Charles Townsend to proceed with his construction project as long as there was no cost to the United States government. At the same time, General Arbuckle was instructed to aid Townsend in the selection of a suitable site on the Fort Smith military reservation.⁴⁶

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 25 March 1857; see also, Francis B. Heitman, *Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army* (Washington, D. C., 1903), I, 677.

⁴² Colonel S. Cooper to Colonel E. V. Sumner, 21 May 1860, *ibid.*

⁴³ Tanner, "Early Episcopal Churches and Missions in Minnesota," 205.

⁴⁴ Shindler, *Public Worship, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 1827-1907*, 14; see also, H. Gregory to J. Kemper, 12 January 1840, *Kemper Papers*.

⁴⁵ George C. Tanner, "History of Fort Ripley, 1849 to 1859, Based on the Diary of Rev. Solon Manney, D.D., Chaplain of this Post 1851 to 1859," *Collections of the State Historical Society of Minnesota*, X (1905), 187.

⁴⁶ General R. Jones to General M. Arbuckle, 18 March 1851, Records of United States Army Commands, Department of the West, Letters Received.

Mr. Townsend had been appointed at Fort Smith on the recommendation of Bishop George W. Freeman of Arkansas as a replacement for Chaplain McManus, who had accepted a position as chaplain at Fort Gibson.⁴⁷ Such a position of missionary enterprise by Townsend was doubtless a stepping stone for Episcopal clergymen in the missionary district of Arkansas and Indian Territory. The Rev. Messrs. William Scull and Daniel McManus, Townsend's predecessors, had found the mission congregations at Fayetteville, Fort Smith, and Van Buren, Arkansas, so frustrating perhaps, that the opportunity for a larger salary and a stable congregation made the position of army chaplain in that region most appealing.⁴⁸

Important persons in regulating religious life at frontier posts were bishops of the Episcopal church. Bishops Leonidas Polk of Louisiana, Freeman of Arkansas, and Kemper of Wisconsin, frequently visited outlying military stations in their respective districts. Mature men in their late fifties or early sixties, these circuit riding bishops braved the elements and dangers of the trail to take the "comforts of religion" to all, including soldiers. Bishop Polk, himself a graduate of West Point, visited Fort Gibson for a week in January, 1841. While there he preached almost every day, and upon his departure was requested by the officers to aid them in securing the services of a permanent chaplain. Through his colleague, Bishop Freeman, Polk was able to make arrangements for a part-time clergyman, then later for the selection of a permanent chaplain, who turned out to be William Scull. After his Fort Gibson visit, Bishop Polk traveled to Fort Smith on January 22, when he baptized one of the soldier's children. On January 31, Polk arrived at Fort Towson, where he preached and baptized two children.⁴⁹

In the spring of 1844, the Right Rev. James H. Otey, Bishop of Tennessee, visited Fort Smith, where, after preaching on several successive Sundays, he was cordially entertained by General Zachary Taylor and members of his staff. Earlier in March, 1844, the bishop had been "kindly received" by the Janus-faced Major Andrews at Fort Towson. Later, Otey gave high praise to the general receptions and safe keeping

⁴⁷ *Journal of the Proceedings of Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in General Convention* (New York, 1850), 268.

⁴⁸ *Journal of the Proceedings . . . of the Protestant Episcopal Church . . .* (New York, 1847), 198.

⁴⁹ *Journal of the Proceedings . . . of the Protestant Episcopal Church . . .* (New York, 1841), 170.

accorded him and his party by the United States army, while traveling through Indian Territory.⁵⁰

At the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in 1844, the Rev. George W. Freeman was elected Missionary Bishop of the Southwest, which included not only Arkansas, but also Indian Territory and Texas. Starting his rounds immediately after his appointment, Bishop Freeman visited Fort Smith early in 1845, where he preached to a large gathering of army officers who happened to be at headquarters of the Western Division for court martial proceedings. Traveling alternately by river steamer and horseback, Bishop Freeman visited Forts Gibson, Washita, and Towson in Indian Territory, and later stopped at San Antonio, Texas. At the latter town, he was petitioned by the populace to make arrangements for a missionary preacher. This project was not immediately accomplished, but when a permanent military post was established there during the Mexican War, the Rev. John F. Fish accepted a position as chaplain.⁵¹

In the Northwest, Bishop Jackson Kemper experienced similar privations and problems in keeping his far-flung jurisdiction well integrated. At one time, in 1856, Kemper had five army chaplains under his jurisdiction, viz: Ezekial Gear at Fort Snelling, Joshua Sweet at Fort Ridgely, Richard Vaux at Fort Laramie, James Du Pui at Fort Kearny, and Solon W. Manney at Fort Ripley. In his report to the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in 1856, Bishop Kemper proudly acclaimed Chaplain Gear's record of having baptized seventeen persons, married seven couples, and confirmed one soldier during his last year at Fort Snelling. At the same time, however, Kemper reflected sorrow for Chaplain Sweet's problems at Fort Ridgely, where there was a small congregation and a small meeting place.⁵²

At posts where no chaplain was available, local or itinerant preachers oftentimes would be invited to conduct religious services for the soldiers. When the Fort Washita garrison lost its regular chaplain in 1852, the post officers took advantage of the presence of a group of migrating Mormons, who were camping near the Fort during the summer of 1853. Professing some interest in the Mormon creed, the commanding officer had little difficulty in persuading one of the Mormon

⁵⁰ John N. Norton, *Life of Bishop Freeman of Arkansas* (New York, 1867), 125; 170.

⁵¹ *Journal of the Proceedings . . . of the Protestant Episcopal Church . . .* (New York, 1856), 271; see also, Greenough White, *An Apostle of the Western Church* (New York, 1900), *passim*; and Johnson, *Chaplains of the General Government*, 68f.

⁵² R. Glisan, *Journal of Army Life* (San Francisco, 1874), 123.

elders to preach at the post, which was done on three occasions. According to Dr. Glisan, the post surgeon, the first two sermons, "sounded very much like good old hardshell Baptist harangues, but the last one contained the doctrinal parts of the faith." After the latter sermon, Glisan reported, many of the Mormon party, having heard statements of dogma for the first time, expressed a desire to return home rather than continuing their journey to the "promised land."⁵³

Usually a Roman Catholic priest had a difficult time in gaining admission to any military post. For example, one of the first Christian missionaries in the vicinity of Fort Snelling was Father Galtier. In the early 1840's, he reported to his bishop that there were few people in the area and that only a handful were Roman Catholics. Fr. Galtier admitted that he had been treated respectfully, but that he was not able to carry on his work too openly because of an undercurrent of anti-Catholic feeling. Galtier mentioned in his report having received two soldiers of Major Joseph Plympton's command who were seeking spiritual aid. These men, the priest indicated, were not converts but rather penitent members of the Church.⁵⁴ In the 1850's, a similar situation existed near Fort Ripley, where a Father Vivaldi operated a missionary post among the Indians. The atmosphere was somewhat more pleasant for him, however, for on a number of occasions he was invited to preach at the Fort. During one visit, he apparently had an amiable conversation in Latin with Chaplain Manney on a variety of ecclesiastical matters.⁵⁵

An unpleasant situation was created at Fort Gibson in 1847, when Lieutenant Charles J. Coutts complained to the Adjutant General's office that his commanding officer, Lieutenant-Colonel Gustavus Loomis, had refused to allow a Father Walsh to preach at the post. Colonel Roger Jones, the Adjutant General, thereupon sent Loomis a blistering letter admonishing him severely for his open anti-Catholic views and for his failing to observe the spirit of the first amendment to the Federal Constitution.⁵⁶ Jones' attitude softened somewhat in a subsequent letter, in which he apologized to Loomis for his earlier rebuff. Jones had investigated the incident and had received a note from Father Walsh, who indicated that it was he and not Colonel Loomis who had declined the use

⁵³ Ambrose McNulty, "The Chapel of St. Paul and the Beginnings of the Catholic Church in Minnesota," *Collections of the State Historical Society of Minnesota*, X (1904), 236.

⁵⁴ Tanner, "History of Fort Ripley," 187.

⁵⁵ Colonel R. Jones to Lieutenant-Colonel G. Loomis, 24 July 1847, Records of United States Army Commands, Department of the West, Letters Received.

⁵⁶ Colonel R. Jones to Lieutenant Colonel G. Loomis, 18 December 1847, *ibid.*

of the Fort Gibson chapel. However, even in the second letter, Jones did reemphasize the necessity of respecting all religious beliefs and creeds within the traditional scope of the complete separation of church and state within the United States.⁵⁷

Ironically, two years earlier, Loomis had shown his ecumenical views by issuing an order within his command to allow any soldier who might be spared from military duties to attend a revival meeting in the neighborhood of Fort Gibson. At the same time, Major George Andrews, who was having his preliminary bout with Chaplain Scull, had issued another order stating that no men at Fort Towson might have time off without special written permission from him personally. When Andrews' order came to Loomis' attention at regimental headquarters, it was immediately countermanded. In a blunt letter to Andrews, Loomis pointed out that if men in Andrews' command could be granted leaves to attend horse races and Indian ball games, as they had on a number of occasions, then certainly it would not seem amiss to allow leaves of absence on week days for voluntary religious exercises.⁵⁸

Most denominations were represented among the army chaplains, yet of the eighty official appointees between 1813 and 1856, only three were Roman Catholic priests. There were many Roman Catholics in the army rank and file during the mid-nineteenth century, especially among German and Irish immigrants, but they rarely formed a majority of a given company or garrison. Moreover, since most of the officers were Protestant, it would have been unlikely that a Roman Catholic chaplain would have been chosen from a list of potential candidates. During the Mexican War, however, President James K. Polk indicated that the appointment of a number of Roman Catholic chaplains might deter desertions among certain of the volunteer troops, especially where a majority might have been recruited from urban areas and where a heavy concentration of Irish and German Catholics were among them. Consequently, two priests, Fathers McElroy and Rey, joined the army in Texas and Mexico, but were never awarded the official status of chaplain. Several years after the war, however, two Roman Catholic priests did become official army chaplains. Father Ignacio Ramirez received an appointment at Fort Monterey, California, and Father Michael Sheehan joined the garrison at Fort Belknap, Texas.

While the majority of officers and men were professed Protestants of one type or another, one denomination could claim the majority in the number of chaplain appointments. Of the forty-two positions filled

⁵⁷ Lieutenant-Colonel G. Loomis to Major G. Andrews, 12 September 1845, *ibid.*

⁵⁸ Office of the Chief of Chaplains, *American Army Chaplaincy*, 21ff.

between 1828 and 1857, twenty-five were filled by Episcopal clergymen. A number of explanations for this phenomenon are possible. During much of the period, an Episcopal clergyman was official chaplain at the Military Academy, from which point a certain amount of influence could have been exerted on the War Department. There also was the possibility that many officers felt that the Episcopal *Book of Common Prayer* would lend itself well to military ceremonies because of its formal wording and multi-purpose contents. At most military posts, the chaplain had a double function of spiritual leader and schoolmaster. Episcopal clergy, like those of the Roman Catholic Church, were required to complete college or seminary training prior to ordination. Ministers of other Protestant denominations may well have been men of letters or of unimpeachable intellectual ability, but more often in the West followers of the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian denominations received their calls from above or from a particular congregation. Thereafter, they received their ministerial status from practical training rather than from academic endeavor.

There was a period of opposition to military chaplains during the 1850's, when Congressmen reacted violently to the religious overtones in the Kansas crisis. However, when the divinely-inspired crusade of Civil War erupted in 1861, opposition was submerged. Thereafter, chaplains were appointed in both Confederate and Union armies. While the mental and moral fibres of the soldier's personality were cared for in the appointment of chaplains, chances for backsliding continued to exist in habits of vice and intemperance. Yet the chaplain did notable work in maintaining opportunity for religious exercises and for personal counseling. The office grew in stature during the post-Civil War era, and has been maintained until the present time.

N.B. All military correspondence from Army Section, War Records Division, National Archives, Washington, D. C.

The Social Thought of William Augustus Muhlenberg

By Richard G. Becker*

THE essential work on the subject of Christian social relations, it can be argued, is St. Augustine's *City of God*. The questions raised and discussed by the Bishop of Hippo are basic and perennial—the implications of the Church's claim to comprise a society, and its relation to society at large. The Church finds itself in a strange land—how then shall it sing its song? How and where shall its principles of charity and brotherhood be applied? Should the Church join itself to the “charitable” efforts of secular, not to say pagan, society? These questions are not without interest to us, and they were of lively interest to one of the greatest Episcopalians of the 19th century.

William Augustus Muhlenberg¹ lived in the days when the “Social Gospel”—that interesting redundancy—was coming to birth in England, but had as yet awakened little interest in our own country. Born on September 16, 1796, he lived most of his life before the impact of Marx or Darwin was felt, but it was a life spent in a boisterous, rapidly growing New York City, where evils were germinating that have since borne their fruit. His main interests were those of a preacher and teacher, and though pastoral activity does not excuse any clergyman from being a theologian, it does explain why Muhlenberg's social views are not to be sought for in lengthy treatises, but in sermons, short tracts addressed to specific questions, and as embodied in his many activities. Of his writings, only a small quantity are extant, and they usually implement his projects. But his “social thought” is in the true Christian tradition; it is always governed by the awareness that the Church as a society exists amid a society which is not of the Church. His questions are ours; his answers are worth our attention.

* The author is rector of St. Christopher's Church, Massapequa, Long Island, New York.—*Editor's note.*

¹ For a short biographical sketch, see George H. Genzmer, in *Dictionary of American Biography*, XIII, 313-314, and bibliography given there.

Anne Ayres, *The Life and Work of William Augustus Muhlenberg* (New York, 1880), pp. 524.

Edward R. Hardy, “Evangelical Catholicism: W. A. Muhlenberg and the Memorial Movement,” in *HISTORICAL MAGAZINE*, XIII (1944), 155ff.

E. Clowes Chorley, *Men and Movements in the American Episcopal Church* (New York, 1946), index *passim*.

The Church of the Holy Communion

There is little need to consider in detail the parochial history of the Church of the Holy Communion, which was the focus of all his activities. Muhlenberg left his educational work in 1843, and in the course of two years, from 1844 to 1846, organized the parish. Episcopalian in all respects, it yet stood in a "free-church" relationship to the diocese and to the Church at large. It was the scene of twelve years of Muhlenberg's ministry, and these twelve years were the heart of his career. Of the importance of this ministry in his life, his words at the laying of the cornerstone on 24 July 1844 are indicative. They reflect a philosophy which was now matured and which would persist throughout the remainder of his life.

Let this sanctuary be called the *Church of the Holy Communion*. Nor let it be only a name. Let it be the ruling idea in forming and maintaining the church. . . . Here let there be a sanctuary consecrated especially to fellowship in Christ, and to the great ordinance of His love. This will rebuke all the distinctions of pride and wealth. . . . As Christians dare not bring such distinctions to the table of the Lord, there, at least, remembering their fellowship in Christ and their common level in redemption, the high and the low; the rich and the poor, gathered together around the sacred board. . . .^{1-a}

The parish was the starting point of all his work during these years. That the words quoted were more than platitudes we shall presently discern.

"Free churches" are today the rule rather than the exception; a century ago, they were the exception rather than the rule. Muhlenberg's views concerning the support of free churches are enlightening:

"Although the free Church of the Holy Communion has always been maintained by the weekly offertory, I have never thought that they should be exclusively the means of support for such churches. The offertory should give the opportunity for all to contribute according to their ability, but, in addition, the more wealthy members of the congregation should subscribe towards an annual reliable income. I say *wealthy* members, because I have always repudiated the notion that free churches should be exclusively for the poor. Their fundamental idea is the rich and the poor, meeting together in the house of the Lord. They are practical demonstrations of the Christian Church as the divine brotherhood. The objection to free churches, that families cannot sit together, could be removed by some agreement among the members of the congregation, whereby the rich and the poor have an equal opportunity of securing regular seats."^{1-b}

^{1-a} Anne Ayres, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

^{1-b} *Ibid.*, pp. 226-227.

Muhlenberg's sister, Mrs. Mary A. Rogers, a wealthy widow, built the church as a "free church" in pursuance of the wishes of her deceased husband.^{1-a}

The first years of the parish's existence saw, in a reasonable measure, the realization of these ideals. It would appear that the pastor succeeded in persuading some wealthy people of the worth of his undertaking:

"Several wealthy and devout families united with Mrs. Rogers in supporting the church at its outset, and in sustaining Dr. Muhlenberg in what were supposed to be his peculiar ministrations."²

This wealth was so handled that, in the fervent words of a disciple, "... there was not 'any that lacked' for want of what a wealthier fellow-communicant could supply. This was instinctive with the pastor, and under his inspiration became an elemental part of the life of the parish."³

The specific forms taken by these charitable activities are mentioned by Miss Ayres:

Besides the large Sunday school, and the boys' choir-classes, there were a day school for boys, another for girls, an Employment Society for furnishing needle-work to the indigent women of the parish, the beginning of the Sisters' systematic care of the poor and of their Dispensary, the Thanksgiving feasts, the church Christmas-trees, and the Fresh Air Fund.⁴

The Fresh Air Fund was simply a fund collected to provide summer vacations for the children of the poor. This usually meant the poor of the parish itself, but sometimes also "other than its own poor people." The Christmas tree for the poor children was (for the first time in history?) made to serve a useful purpose. The rich children gave all the presents. That there may have been condescension is apparent, but the net result must have been satisfactory, and, it is said, the rector would tolerate nothing but a genuine charitable spirit.⁵

A few words will point up the role and significance of these activities. According to Miss Ayres:

At the beginning of the Church of the Holy Communion, not only was there no such thing known amongst us as a church hospital, but there was not, at least in the city of New York, a church charity of

^{1-a} *Ibid.*, p. 175.

² *Ibid.*, p. 197.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 200.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 208.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

any kind, unless we allow the Sunday School and its concomitants to be such; not a single orphanage, home for the aged, house of mercy for the fallen, or shelter of whatever sort; and it is not too much to claim that the new life breathed not only into the church, but into the community at large. . . .⁶

If revulsion from the evils of the day was to be a great force in social action in another fifty years, it was not so in the middle of the century. There were evils aplenty and they were deplored; but the basis of Muhlenberg's work was positive. It was the natural outcome of his conception of the Church. Charitable activity was not at any time either a sop thrown by a basically unconcerned group, or a hobby of a group concerned for nothing else. It was a balanced thing, an "extension of the community of the altar," which Dr. Muhlenberg advocated in his opening address.

The charitable activity of the parish itself, and to some extent that of institutions related to the Church, was usually directed at its own communicants. This indicated that there were enough poor in the parish to constitute a needy group, and enough rich to supply those needs—that is, it was a "mixed" parish in an economic sense. Further, there was no direct concern for the overall aspects of charitable activities. This can be deplored, and in its flagrant form was deplored by Muhlenberg himself, but it did serve a necessary purpose by defining the sphere of action at a time when Muhlenberg and his followers admitted that it would be impossible to change society at large overnight.

Saint Luke's Hospital

In reading the Gospels, everyone must have noticed how much of the time of our blessed Lord was taken up with doing good to the *bodies* of men. While He came as if on an errand only to the inner man of the soul, He was constantly ministering to the outer man of the flesh—ever proclaiming the truth for the cure of spiritual ills, yet ever engaged in relieving temporal ills. As he assumed our entire humanity, so he applied himself to the healing of its maladies, in all their kinds and forms; dispensing, both as the sign of a greater, and for its own sake, a temporal salvation.⁷

This is a good statement of Muhlenberg's thought concerning his work of ministration to the sick. The cholera visitation of 1849 had given an impetus to his thinking. In 1850, he began his work towards the founding of St. Luke's Hospital. It began humbly enough on St.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 206.

⁷ Wm. A. Muhlenberg, *A Plea for a Church Hospital* (New York, 1850), p. 7.

Luke's day of that year, with a loose offering of just thirty dollars. The idea of a hospital was the fruit of the very first years of his ministry at his parish. "In his pastoral visitations among the lowly ones of his flock, he became painfully impressed with the distressing condition of such in the places they called their homes, when sickness overtook them."⁸ Again, his thought in such matters sprang from a fundamental sense of community within the parish.

Although the project itself was begun in the form of his appeal in 1850, it did not assume substantial proportions for some years. Meanwhile, a small dispensary was operated by the church itself, the work therein being done by the Sisters who were just then coming into existence as an order. After the hospital became a reality—by 1858 or so—he gave much time to it, and did so until his retirement.

His thought in the matter bears examination. During the cholera plague of the forties, "he was unremitting in his visits to the Cholera Hospital on West Thirteenth Street, which by proximity he considered one of his fields of duty." And there are his own words as to the risk—and duty—involved in this:

"Let me make allowance for my brother clergymen who do not see it their duty; but if it is only a kind word to the sufferers, it is something for Christ's sake,—it is the 'cup of cold water.' To pass by such an hospital on your way to church, without ever entering it, seems to me is to play the priest and the Levite of the parable."⁹

He never thought himself an individualist in this emphasis, as he speaks at length of the history of the Church's ministry to the sick. The Church, he says, during the apostolic age still possessed the powers of spiritual healing; but when this age passed ". . . the Church never thought of laying aside . . . her office as the benefactor of the sick, but rather made it her favorite work of love."¹⁰ Under a regularized procedure, ministration to the sick became the work of the various orders. So it continued to be until the modern state began to assume responsibility for the sick and the needy. The Church then gladly and justly stepped out of the picture, but even then not completely. It continued to minister to the poor and the sick. But in recent times there had been a falling off of such ministration. The result was that the sick did not in any way receive the spiritual comfort and guidance that they should have during their sickness. The hospital, an institution peculiar to Chris-

⁸ Ayres, *op. cit.*, 203.

⁹ Ayres, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

¹⁰ Muhlenberg, *A Plea* . . . , p. 10.

tendom, has largely passed out of the hands of the Church, and it is high time that the Church should re-enter the field.

Muhlenberg met objections to such ministry on the grounds that the Church's mission was to the "souls of men," but might never ignore their physical existence. His words are as challenging now as at the time of their utterance.

If it be said that our first care must be for the *spiritual* wants of the poor, let it be granted, and then the question is only to be put, what are we doing so extensively in that line, that it may serve as an offset to our apathy in regard to their temporal wants? What system have we in operation for christianizing the masses in the lower walks of life? What ministry have we for the highways and hedges? How have we made it an object to gather to the gospel board those whom of all others we are most enjoined to call to the feast? Do we go and invite them in? Where are our city missionaries?¹¹

Considering the paucity of such thought in his day, his attitude is of considerable interest. Certainly people continually objected that the work was too great for the Church to undertake, that all of society must be awakened before anything could be done, or that, as he noted, the Church's mission to the spiritual needs was to be so construed that it had nothing to say about the temporal needs of people. It cannot be said that Muhlenberg entirely escaped these notions. It will be seen what limitations he was willing to place upon the extent of such work, and he admitted that he thought the Church's mission was primarily to the souls of men. Yet to his mind, souls were always very much incarnate.

Saint Johnland

As Miss Ayres suggests, this project was the "Benjamin of his old age." It aimed at taking whole families or individuals out of their city environment and transplanting them to Long Island, where he had procured a tract of isolated land. There they should be settled in a community, learn trades which would make them self-supporting and, equally important, be given some opportunity for healthy family life. The statement of aims is worth quoting:

First: To provide cheap and comfortable homes, together with the means of social and moral improvement, for deserving families from among the working classes, particularly in the city of New York, and such as can carry on their work at St. Johnland; but this provision shall never be used for pecuniary emolument, either to the Society or to any of the Agents in its employ. . . .

Third: To assist indigent boys and young men who desire literary

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

education, with a view to the Gospel Ministry, but affording them the opportunity for such education, and, at the same time, means of self-support by some useful employment.¹²

Clearly this was not a mere charitable institution in the modern sense of that expression. It was to be concerned with the "remnant" among the poor who had retained a measure of their self-respect and morality, and only such as could support themselves by the exercise of their trades. It shows, then, this limitation: Muhlenberg believed that some of the poverty-stricken were justly so, and that little could be done for them. But among the poor he always thought some had resisted "tarnishing" to such an extent that they could be, and deserved to be, rehabilitated. What of the rest? He had little to say, save for an occasional remark that some of them seemed to deserve their poverty. He was at one with his times to this extent—he thought these evils were at least in most cases the results of personal sins, and that people could not be helped until they had reformed themselves, and then could seek help from outside agencies.¹³

If this limitation of thought may be regretted, the institution itself was worthy enough. True, it did not allow for environmental factors in moral degeneration; yet so far as it went, it performed a real and lasting service. It was Church-centered from the outset. There was constructed in the middle of the village a church, and services were regularly held and well-attended. It is not an exaggeration to say that the whole project had a substantial religious basis.

Muhlenberg's Social Teachings Generally Considered

The best source on this subject is a single document called *Retro-prospectus*.¹⁴ It bears close examination. It consists of two letters supposed to have been written by one visiting St. Johnland ten years after its foundation. Muhlenberg calls the attention of the reader to the conditions of the city in which he lives, to the poverty, crowded quarters, and to the environment of the streets in which children must grow up as best they can. He admits that it is not possible to alter the whole picture. "The evil is too gigantic for any grasp of reform at all conceivable. It calls for legislative interference; and that . . . would call for more public virtue than exists." Short of this remedy, what is to be done? He admits that the city itself is doing *something*, in its reforma-

¹² Ayres, *op. cit.*, pp. 424-425.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 401-405.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

tories and other benevolent agencies. But "they cannot change circumstances, and their inevitable consequences. They can not remove cause, and, of course, not effects." Yet the writer feels that "... there are green spots even in those deserts, and doubtless far more than we see." And here enters his doctrine of the "Poor Remnant"—"There are individuals and families having a keen sense of the wretchedness of their condition but powerless to escape it . . . They are hard workers." It is for these that he begs of his Christian readers "... some little share of family enjoyments, to which you can not think they have forfeited every right." It is these for whom "... their poverty is not their righteous excommunication." He can conceive no objection from those "... who are in the midst of plenty, encompassed by a gracious and bountiful providence . . ."

Thus *Retro-prospectus*. It is addressed to Christian readers. This point is worthy of note, for in the mind of Muhlenberg, all of these teachings were not simple humanitarianism, but rather the necessary result of any reasonable doctrine of the Church. In fact, the whole viewpoint is the outcome of the doctrine of the Incarnation.

"The coming of our Lord in the flesh creates a new relation in the human family. In Him men are bound together by an original tie, arising out of their union with Him, as having taken their nature upon Him, and thus having become their Brother, while He is at the same time their God."

If this be true, believers are not mere associates or fellow-beings, but fellow members of Christ. It is this which "gives birth to genuine, specific Christian charity," and which is the true love of the brethren. Again, it is this fact which dictates that for Christians there must be group works as well as individual works for the poor.¹⁵

From the Incarnation, he proceeds to the Church, as Catholic and Apostolic, in displaying the basis of his teaching. His language is worth quoting:

It is not enough that in Creeds and Liturgies and Ordinances we are so like the primitive Church, while in practice we present so many more features of contrast than resemblance. It will not do to wrap ourselves complacently in our ancient robes, full proud that they are of "wrought gold" if we care not to throw their generous folds over the homeless and the naked.

There must be revival of the old heart of the Church, which throbbed with love to Christ shown in love to the brethren, long before the architecture we emulate was known.¹⁶

¹⁵ Muhlenberg, *A Plea* . . . , p. 35.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

Men must see us in earnest with something like apostolic charity, or they will make no account of our apostolic descent.¹⁷ To this extent, charity is to be a minimal function of Christian love;¹⁸ it is the primitive Church, with things in common, that is to be emulated. We have preserved our credal contact with it, but have lost grasp of Christian charity. Our Catholicism is similarly impoverished: "What do we mean? We call ourselves Catholics? What are we doing for the people—for our brothers and sisters who never hear the Gospel preached; who will not come near our churches; who claim that the Church is only for the rich?"¹⁹

What of the poor? Are they always to be with us? Is poverty part of the order of God?

O wondrous piety! to refrain from interfering with the providence of God. O discerning Churchmanship! . . . to look at the poor, and to see among them no members of Christ's body—to recognize no spiritual relationship between them and us, as their claim in our sympathy. . . .²⁰

Yet it was objected that the problem was too great to be handled by the Church. He granted this, but continued in forceful terms: "Because we cannot by any well devised scheme of political economy help them all, we care effectually to help none—forgetting, that in that wretched herd there are fellow members of the Household of Faith."²¹ It was especially for these that he entered his plea—for those who had retained a longing for better things. He pointed out the price of this neglect of the poor in the realm of education. "We bid the poor to bring their children to be christened," he says, "and where do we bid them send their children to be educated according to their christening? Almost the only schools to which they can gain admission, are those which know not Christ or His Baptism . . . little can the Sunday School avail against the counter currents of the week."²²

An interesting side-glance on the matter of rich and poor is afforded by his comments on the English bishops and the English Church. He says, generally: "With all the good that is doing in the Church of England, I can't help fearing for her, so long as she is so little the

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

¹⁸ Behold, how easy this redundancy!

¹⁹ Ayres, *op. cit.*, p. 268.

²⁰ Muhlenberg, *A Plea* . . . , p. 23.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 30.

poor man's church. . . ." The bishops fare little better. "The Bishops come forward only when something touching their rights or the rights of the Church is on the carpet. They don't stand up for truth and righteousness in great political questions. . . ."²³ This was his most pointed observation about the Church of England—that it did not reach the poor! an exception was the study group on the Gospel according to Saint John which he attended, part of a project of F. D. Maurice.

If a chief concern, the poor were not the only concern of the good pastor. He involved himself considerably in the campaign known as the "Midnight Mission." This, of course, was a society for the reclamation of prostitutes, and was not directly the work of the Church. He pointed out in another connection that such work as ". . . a retreat for aged widows and the destitute women. . . ." ought to be a matter of course in an apostolic Church "with but a tithe of apostolic love. . . ." The poor, the sick, the aged, the "fallen"—all of these came within his purview.²⁴

To return for a moment to his distinction between general humanitarianism and Christian charity:

Do good unto all men—that is the benevolence of humanity—but especially unto them that are of the house-hold of faith—that is the sympathy of the new nature in Christ.²⁵

In connection with the campaign for St. Luke's Hospital, he pointed out some of the necessary deficiencies of secular aid to the sick. Admitting that the state-supported hospital is "one of the civil benefits of the Gospel," he stresses its shortcoming—

"the commonwealth, whatever be its good intentions or the value of its services, can never do the work of the Body of Christ, nor can that body, without a perverted conscience, and serious injury to her dearest interests, ever turn over to other hands what her Lord, by his emphatic example and solemn injunction, has charged upon herself."

It is evident that "in the nature of things, no municipal establishments *can* meet the wants of the case."²⁶ For there must be provision for spiritual wants, and this provision cannot be made in state institutions.

His views flowed directly from his thought about the Church—what it is and what it ought to do. His views in this respect are not quite the same as the later "social gospel." Muhlenberg was "Church-centered"

²³ Ayres, *op. cit.*, p. 286.

²⁴ Muhlenberg, *A Plea* . . . , p. 33.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 14, 15, 16.

in a way that liberal Protestantism would not understand. Nothing but Christian charity would satisfy him; charity in general was not enough.

We are not lacking in the spirit of charity, or rather what is reckoned such, and what in a great measure is such; but that in which we *are* lacking is distinctive Christian charity. We have the charity of pity, of compassionate impulse, of tender-heartedness—those divine graces of humanity—but we have not enough of the spirit of a thoroughly evangelized charity, and which I may call *Church* charity, because of its flowing from our fellow-membership in the Church.²⁷

The Nature and Function of the Church

What, then, did he understand to be the nature of the Church? What did he conceive the Church's role to be? Is it a matter of converting individuals and sending them forth? Is the Church to be just another institution devoted to general charitable works?

As in practice the parish of the Holy Communion was the jumping off point for Muhlenberg, so in theory his conception of the Church was the basis for all his thought. The Church is first and foremost the "Society of Brethren." The Church is essentially social, a society whose bond of unity is in Christ, whose relationships of person to person are most commonly represented in the New Testament as those of brotherhood.²⁸ The Church is not a human institution, organized for the sake of convenience or practicality; rather,

The Catholic Church is the universal society of the brethren in Christ which has existed from the beginning, when the Son of God was made flesh, and men by believing in him became the sons of God . . . all who believe in him and are baptized constitute this brotherhood.²⁹

Evidently the functions of the Church are properly those of a divine fellowship—more properly so than in the case of any simply human organization of people.

The implications of this view for the role of individual and corporate effort, as related to each other, are easily seen. The good pastor had generous individuals in his congregation who gave to various charities, for he acknowledges—

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

²⁸ W. A. Muhlenberg, *Evangelical Catholic Papers: comprising Addresses, Lectures, and Sermons* . . . , compiled by Anne Ayres (New York, 1877), p. 368.

²⁹ Ayres, *op. cit.*, p. 243.

We do not forget the poor, and we give something to the societies.³⁰

We are not wanting in the offices of humanity, but we do them as individuals, or as members of private societies, and hence they are not to the purpose.³¹

The individual Christian, converted, changed, is not the simple answer to the crying social evils. There must be action by the Church as a Church. Admirable though individual efforts may be, they are not "to the purpose," for they do not carry the Church with them, but come as purely private generosity or the work of some private society. At the same time, corporate action was not emphasized at the cost of individual sacrifice. Nowhere does he speak more pointedly:

We do not forget the poor, and we give something to the societies: at the same time we provide for ourselves as far as we can afford it, much in the same manner as the people of the world. We are as fond of our comforts as they are, our tables are supplied with the same luxuries, our houses are furnished with the same show and glare . . . the sober, righteous and godly life, the renunciation of the *spirit* of the world as well as of some two or three of its amusements, the pursuit of gain regulated by the golden rule, the restrained and cautious indulgence in pleasure, the resolute self-control, the subjugation of pride, the quiet imitation of Christ, the crucifying of the flesh with the affections and lusts . . . how rarely are they the fruits of the popular religion.³²

It was in this respect, clearly, that the Christian and the worldling parted company. Christian charity is something quite different from that of the pagan or heathen world:

The kind action that costs us nothing, is of doubtful virtue. To eat, drink and be merry, and send a portion to the poor, is the generosity of the world: it is very well, but it has nothing peculiarly Christian in it—a heathen might do it as well as a Christian.³³

The mark of the Christian in giving was that we would be satisfied with a plainer garment and forego the usual comforts in order to help a needy brother. Thus is individual effort stressed; yet it is to be channelled through the Church, for Christians acting singly can never fulfil the purposes of the Church as a body. This is so for the simple reason that the spirit of the Church's care is to be such that "they are

³⁰ W. A. Muhlenberg, *The Voice of the Church and the Times* (New York, 1840), p. 5.

³¹ Muhlenberg, *A Plea* . . . , p. 19.

³² Muhlenberg, *The Voice of the Church* . . . , p. 5.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

treated as members of Christ's Church, and are made to feel . . . still within the embrace of her charity."³⁴

The World and Its Business

"The renunciation of the *spirit* of the world as well as of some two or three of its practices, and pursuit of gain regulated by the golden rule. . . ."³⁵

How rarely indeed is this the fruit of the popular religion.

The tabulation and condemnation of contemporary business practices, with which Dr. Muhlenberg furnishes us, is fairly penetrating. The document most illuminating on this subject is his address on the occasion of the great New York fire of the 1830's—for him the fire was clearly a rebuke from on high.

The essence of the evil is the failure to relate Christianity to the practices of business. "Let the answer be candid—they are not to be brought into its light. Christianity is altogether another matter. They are to be tried by the maxims of trade, and trade has maxims of its own."³⁶ Candor is understood to be wholly improper in business transactions. The mottos are "get rich, by fair means if possible, by all means get rich," and "keep all you get and get all you can." If it be objected (and it always is) that these are ineradicable features of the human being, it remains true that "they are developed more or less by circumstances, and it is in our great commercial marts that we see them carried out in their full extent." Anything goes; and it is easily seen "into what licentious extremes this selfishness will run. . . ."³⁷

It is the worship of money that is at the basis of this evil. Muhlenberg holds that the true miser is a rare specimen—that money generally is worshipped as a means to power of all sorts. That it is in fact worshipped is implied by his rhetorical questions: "To what . . . do they consecrate their energies? for what are they toiling by day and scheming by night? for what in one great crowd are they all rushing forward, out of breath, and as if for their very lives?"³⁸ Money, the pecuniary superiority over their neighbors—this is the goal, the chief end of most people's lives.

"How will some other practices stand the test of Christianity?" Not

³⁴ Muhlenberg, *A Plea* . . . , p. 17.

³⁵ Muhlenberg, *The Voice of the Church* . . . , p. 5.

³⁶ Muhlenberg, *The Rebuke of the Lord: A Sermon* (Jamaica, N. Y., 1835), pp. 8-9.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ *The Rebuke of the Lord*, p. 10.

at all well. The most common artifices of the buyer and seller, everyday occurrences, taken for granted—"would these things be reckoned honorable if custom had not sanctioned them?" Never, and the result is not only personal dishonesty, but commercial practices which "may occasion distress and suffering in a part of the community."³⁹ Money may indeed be made by fair means, and there is such a thing as business conducted on an upright basis.⁴⁰ But such practices are becoming rapidly antiquated. Money must be made faster and faster, and it is "superior art" rather than sound industry that is resorted to for the increase of wealth. Business has been turned into a deadly game in which the few and the crafty survive.

Nor is this situation without effect on the whole community and the individuals involved in it. Laying aside the plight of the poor man who must sacrifice his children for the sake of staying alive by their labor, he stresses the deliberate evil of the man who, speaking to his son, "tells him it is time to lay aside his books and to learn to do something for himself in the world . . . a store is selected for him and a master that is known 'to drive his business,' and has the name of making sharp men of his boys." All of the training of the home must then be reversed, and the young man must "know *when* to exercise them (the common virtues) in the store . . . he is taught . . . the art and its application of an *honest duplicity*."⁴¹

The fruits of the system, then, are social evils and personal dishonesty. The material speaks for itself. There is evident no trace of a careful consideration of the "theology" of capitalism; or of money, or of anything of the sort. At the same time, the spirit of unlimited gain and of absolute competition, as well as the doctrine of the autonomy of economic practices—all important aspects of capitalism—are roundly censured. If Muhlenberg only touched the surface of economic theory, as a discerning Christian observer, he was keenly aware of the evil of current economic practices.

Conclusion

Muhlenberg in theory and practice waged successful war on the carnivorous economy of his time. He sought to point out its dangers to individuals involved in it, and to set in motion in particular lives, and in the life of the Church, the forces of God which could save men from the worst evils of the system. While he was not a philosopher or a the-

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

ologist in the technical sense, we have seen that his action flowed logically from his thought. The question of the relation of the Church to society was answered by him in practice as well as in word. The Church exists to be the Church, and can be of no use to anyone if it forgets its primary call. It is to do what it can, and what it alone can do, to save men where they are, if possible—but by physical removal if necessary. Thus, Muhlenberg checked any tendency on the part of his followers improperly to “spiritualize” the Church. His contributions to the social thought and practices of the Church, while not earth-shaking, are of lasting interest. His answers to the questions of our culture are far more coherent than many now being given—and the questions are the same.

When Muhlenberg died in the hospital he had founded on April 8, 1877, aged eighty years, and was buried at St. Johnland, he was already being revered as one of the prophets of the American Episcopal Church; and like most prophets, it was recognized by the spiritually discerning that he was a man ahead of his time. To a later generation, with the benefit of the perspective of history, he is seen as the outstanding presbyter of his generation.

Appendix

“Retro-prospectus”*

After Muhlenberg had drawn his picture of Christian socialism in the pamphlet he called *Retro-prospectus*, he asked the question, “Shall it be no more than a dream?” He then proceeds “to plead through terrible facts in the social condition of our city for means for its realization”:

Before answering the question, my Christian reader, to whom I beg to address it, allow me to ask you to look at that which is no dream. Let me turn your eyes to that which exists in no aerial regions of the brain, but in regions earthly enough and not miles away from your own doors. Look at those quarters of your city where the people herd by fifties and hundreds in a house, street after street. Look at them huddled together in narrow rooms with surroundings and effluvia where a half-hour's stay would sicken you. See places which might rather be stalls or sties than human abodes. Look at the swarm of children in the streets, on the stoops, at the windows, half-naked or in unwashed rags. See the crowds of rough, half-grown boys in knots at the corners, quick at all sorts of wickedness, loud in foulness and blasphemy, the ready and the worst element of your riots. Mark the looks and the talk of the populace of the dram

* From Anne Ayres, *The Life and Work of William Augustus Muhlenberg* (New York, 1880), pp. 401-405.

shops, and then the exhibitions of godlessness, drunkenness, and licentiousness on the Lord's day, turning it, I had almost said, into Satan's day. And why do I ask you to look at such a revolting state of things among those thousands of your neighbors? In the hope that aught which you or I can do will better it? To propose any scheme for its material improvement? Alas, no. The evil is too gigantic for any grasp of reform at all conceivable. It calls for legislative interference; and that, could any practicable mode of melioration be shown, would call for more public virtue than exists. This massing of human beings, prolific of those vices and miseries, is profitable to too many pockets. The exorbitant rents of the smallest dens or of the larger tenements swell the gains of landlords, who have the plea for any amount of rapacity, that they only meet a demand. Their receptacles overflow with those who must have stopping-places where they can get their bread. The insular city cannot be expanded into space for any fit or healthful housing of the poor in those quarters of it where they must consort. This stowage of souls and bodies—our municipal disgrace—is, I fear, a necessity—in view of its terrible evils, a dire necessity—how dire we have not yet seen.

Our benevolent, reformatory, and religious agencies do not stand aloof. They work on with a persistent zeal, encouraged by the least success; but anything like the elevation of a whole locality is beyond their hopes. They can not change circumstances, and their inevitable consequences. They can not remove cause, and, of course, not effects. What they do today is undone tomorrow, to be done again the next day, and then again undone. The good seed is perseveringly sown, but the field is already rank with tares. The means of salvation are proffered and urged, but amid overpowering means of destruction. The noxious physical and moral circumstances are ever acting and reacting with cumulative force. The cleanliness which is next to godliness, among the degraded poor finds no place. In filth sin is in its element, and has its most disgusting outgrowths.

Again, then, why do I ask you to look at a state of things confessedly so hopeless? Hopeless in the aggregate, but not in the particulars. It would be sad, indeed, if in our dark delineation it was all dark; dreadful, if in those masses of humanity it was all vile. But it is not. There are green spots even in those deserts, and doubtless far more than we see. The forbidding aspects do not indicate universally corresponding facts. There are exceptions, and often most interesting ones. Every here and there are individuals and families having a keen sense of the wretchedness of their condition, but powerless to escape it. Many of them once used to other modes of life, while they submit to their lot, yet for its worse than temporal ills can not be reconciled to it. Strangers to aught of domestic comfort, they are unrepining yet not without longings for the sweets and decencies of home. They are parents, and can not be indifferent to the perils of their offspring. They are hard workers. They are above begging, and to keep above it they must live as and where they do.

For the sake of these it is I show you these hapless multitudes—these among them, yet not of them; these toiling, suffering poor; these Christians steadfast amid unchristian influences and anti-christian forces which would try a more enlightened faith than theirs; these fellow-members of the household of faith, perchance of your own particular communion. To the rescue of these and theirs, whom they love as you love yours, I invoke you. For these I beg Christian homes and privileges, and some little share of family enjoyments, to which you can not think they have forfeited every right. You will not say that their poverty is their righteous excommunication. To show how they may be rescued, I have dreamed of them, transplanted by your bounty, to where they can live, and not morely exist . . . a Christian industrial community, a rural settlement in which the worthy, diligent poor may have becoming abodes, with the means and rewards of diligence, together with the provisions of the Gospel—will that be dismissed as a dream?

It can not be. It is not to be conceived of Christians who are in the midst of plenty, encompassed by a gracious and bountiful providence, having scarce a wish within the wide limits of their means ungratified, and acknowledging their responsibility for the use of their manifold gifts and opportunities, that they will turn aside from a practical philanthropy commending itself . . . to their minds and hearts: a scheme not to increase, but to lessen the numbers of dependents upon alms-giving; not to encourage and so multiply the indolent poor, but to help them to help themselves; to lift them up to an honest independence; to give them what on any scale of Christian justice is their due. . . .

The History and Symbolism of the Flag of the American Episcopal Church

By Jane Houghtaling Luce*

IT WAS not until October 16, 1940, that the General Convention in Kansas City adopted unanimously, first in the House of Bishops and then also unanimously in the House of Deputies, an official flag for the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. The subject of such a flag had been under consideration for many years. As a matter of fact, it was by only a few votes that the General Convention of 1931 in Denver failed to adopt such a banner.

The history of the Church flag goes back thirty-seven years, to 1918 when the diocese of Long Island celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. At that time, the then Bishop of Long Island, Dr. Frederick Burgess, appointed a committee to make plans for observing the anniversary, and to head the committee he chose one of his best known laymen, William M. Baldwin.

Among Mr. Baldwin's plans, he included a great procession through the lovely grounds of the Cathedral of the Incarnation, at Garden City, to precede the anniversary service in the Cathedral. To heighten its color, Mr. Baldwin arranged with heraldic experts to design banners to be carried in the procession. There was a diocesan banner, three for the archdeaconries, twenty for the diocesan societies, and one for each parish and mission, a total of some hundred and seventy banners in all. The flags made the procession a fine and picturesque sight, but one thing saddened Mr. Baldwin; that was the absence of a flag representing the Episcopal Church in America. Quite a number of other churchmen agreed with Mr. Baldwin about this matter, and so the next Long Island diocesan convention petitioned General Convention to take up the matter of having an official Church flag. General Convention appointed a commission to take care of the matter, and Mr. Baldwin became secretary of the commission.

Mr. Baldwin, who was a member of the Long Island Cathedral chapter, gave some twenty years' work and thought to the flag which has been adopted. He is, indeed, "the father of the flag," and all church-

* The author who resides in Sharon, Connecticut, states in her foreword: "Grateful acknowledgment is made to Mr. Frank Gulden, Dr. C. Rankin Barnes, Dean Lawrence Rose, Dr. J. Chauncey Linsley, the Rev. Charles Henry Webb, and Mrs. George N. Emory, without whose willing and helpful cooperation I could not have compiled the following treatise."

men have reason to be deeply appreciative of his loyal and painstaking work as secretary of the commission. October 16, 1940, was a great day for him, when the General Convention held in Kansas City adopted the banner, and a very appropriate day, too, since it marked the hundred and fifty-first anniversary of the day when the Philadelphia General Convention ratified the Constitution and Canons of the Episcopal Church and adopted our Book of Common Prayer in the year 1789.

While Mr. Baldwin made the design as well as the original model of the flag, he consulted with Mr. Pierre DecLaRose, who was one of the leading American authorities on heraldry. Mr. DecLaRose, incidentally, was a Roman Catholic, and designed the coats of arms of the majority of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in this country. He gladly contributed his time and services regarding the flag.

Story has it that when Mr. Baldwin presented his model of the flag to the General Convention, to his great disappointment, it proved to be too small, and he was asked to present a full size replica. So, he went shopping in Kansas City and purchased some Turkey red cotton, some pale blue material, and a child's crib sheet, scissors and thimble, needles and thread, and in his hotel room that night, he and the Rev. Hubert S. Wood, later dean of the Cathedral in Garden City, worked diligently. The following day, Mr. Baldwin triumphantly displayed the full size facsimile of the flag to the General Convention. Mr. Baldwin was asked to give the original crib-sheet model to the archives of the National Cathedral at Washington, but he said he would make them a duplicate, which he did, presenting the original, however, to the Cathedral of the Incarnation in Garden City, his own church. When he died, it covered his coffin during the burial service held in the cathedral.

William M. Baldwin was born in New York City. After graduating from the School of Mines at Columbia University in 1884, he engaged in special studies at Yorkshire College, Leeds, England. He returned to enter his father's business. Subsequently, he became president of several companies manufacturing dye wood and tanning extracts. He retired after thirty-five years as a manufacturer. For twenty-six years, Mr. Baldwin was a member of the chapter of the Cathedral of the Incarnation in Garden City, Long Island, and for five terms he was lay deputy from that diocese to the General Convention. He was president of the Church Club of Long Island, secretary and treasurer of the National Federation of Church Clubs of the United States, and a member of the Church Club of New York. From 1912 to 1922, he was president of the Nassau Hospital at Mineola, Long Island, and at the time of his death, he was a director and member of the executive committee. He was a trustee and

former president of the New York State School of Agriculture at Farmingdale, Long Island. Mr. Baldwin died in New York City at the age of seventy-nine, on January 4, 1942.

The flag's symbolism is full of interest. The white field represents the purity of the Christian religion. The red cross throughout the white field represents the sacrifice of our Blessed Lord, and the blood of the martyrs. It has been used for centuries as the Flag of Faith of the Christian Church throughout the world. The red cross on a white field is the cross of Saint George, the patron saint of England, and indicates our descent from the Church of England. The blue of the dexter chief in the upper left-hand corner is not the deep ocean blue of the American Flag, but the light blue of the sky, often used by old artists for the clothing of the Blessed Virgin. It is called Madonna blue, and represents the human nature of our Lord which He received from His mother. The nine white cross-crosslets on the blue field represent the nine original dioceses of the Episcopal Church in America in 1789: Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Delaware, and South Carolina. The cross-crosslets are also called Jerusalem crosses. These were deliberately used as a reminder that Jerusalem was the birth-place of the Church and are symbolical of the spread of Christianity. They are arranged in the form of a St. Andrew's Cross to commemorate the fact that Bishop Samuel Seabury, our first American prelate, was consecrated in Aberdeen, Scotland, on November 14, 1784. This is the cross upon which St. Andrew, the first Apostle, was crucified and is the cross of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. The colors red, white, and blue obviously represent our country and stand for the American branch of the Anglican Communion.

It seems fitting at this point to say a few words about our first Bishop, the Right Rev. Samuel Seabury. The following is quoted from an address by the Rt. Rev. Harold Edward Wynn, D.D., Lord Bishop of Ely, given at a joint meeting of the Seabury Society for the Preservation of the Glebe House and the Old Woodbury Historical Society on November 14, 1950.

"Up to the outbreak of the Revolutionary War in 1775, those who wished to be ordained had to go to England. It was a dangerous journey and a long one; about one in five was either lost at sea or died of illness. When the War of Independence ended, there were fourteen ordained clergymen of the Church of England in the State of Connecticut. Their position had been difficult. Most of them were on the side of the English Government, and therefore had to face a good deal of unpopularity; indeed, at times, persecution and imprisonment; but they carried on their

work and remained at their posts after the colonies became independent.

"For many years applications had been sent to England for a bishop, and indeed it says much for the faithfulness and stability of the Episcopalians in this country that during these many years they remained faithful to the Apostolic Church Order in spite of neglect and discouragement. The Bishop of London had jurisdiction over the colonies, but he never visited them, though he appointed commissaries who were in every case only priests. In spite of many requests, no bishop was sent to America while the colonies were still under the British Crown.

"Just before the end of the Revolutionary War it was suggested by an Episcopal clergyman that, at any rate until peace was declared, Episcopalians who wished to be ordained should accept ordination by presbyters. This proposal, however, did not meet with general approval, and on March 25, 1783, the year in which peace was signed between England and her former colonies, ten clergymen of Connecticut met in the Glebe House at Woodbury, and elected the Rev. Samuel Seabury for consecration as first bishop of the now independent state. (In 1771, the Rev. John Rutgers Marshall was ordained by the Bishop of London 'to the Ministry at Woodbury in the new Republick of Connecticut.' A glebe in Great Britain is a portion of land attached to an ecclesiastical benefice as part of its endowment, and accordingly the property, purchased as a home for Mr. Marshall, came to be known as The Glebe House.) A letter was drawn up to be conveyed by Dr. Seabury to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and within a short time Dr. Seabury was on his way to England.

"We must now retrace our steps and see what has been happening on the other side of the water. Although the archbishops and bishops of England had been either unwilling or fearful to agree to the consecration of a bishop in America, there were not a few priests in England seriously concerned over the neglect by the Mother Church of her children overseas. Among these was Dr. George Berkeley. He was the son of the Bishop of Cloyne, whose name is associated as well with missionary work in the New World as with the study of theology and philosophy, and from whom the Divinity School at New Haven takes its name.

"It was obvious that nothing could be done during the war. The Provisional Articles of Peace were signed on November 30, 1782. Dr. Berkeley had already written to Bishop Skinner, Bishop Coadjutor of Aberdeen, suggesting that the bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland might be able to help 'the suffering and nearly neglected sons of Protestant Episcopacy on the other side of the Atlantic.' Bishop Skinner asked Dr. Berkeley to explain his ideas more fully, and it is interesting

to note that a later letter of Dr. Berkeley to Bishop Skinner is dated March 25, 1783, the day on which the ten clergymen of Connecticut met at Woodbury and elected Dr. Seabury.

"Dr. Seabury arrived in England in June, 1783. He was received kindly by the Bishop of London, but it soon became evident that neither he nor the two archbishops were prepared to take any definite step in the matter of consecration. There were indeed legal difficulties. Under the law as it then was, a bishop on consecration had to take the oath of allegiance to the king of England, and this in the circumstances was impossible. It was thought that so soon after the end of the war, when there was quite naturally a feeling of antagonism to the colonies which had lately gained their independence, was hardly a time in which to suggest to Parliament an amending act; and the prevailing temper of the Church of England in the 18th century was not one that encouraged experiments, especially when they were likely to produce political complications. Moreover, under its charter, the S.P.G. could support only churches in countries dependent upon Great Britain, and therefore doubt was expressed whether the new bishop would be able to support himself now that the S.P.G. grant had been withdrawn.

"As the days went on, it became obvious to Seabury that he had little hope of obtaining consecration in England. Someone had suggested that he should apply to the Danish Church, and it was in this connection that Dr. Martin Joseph Routh, a fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, told a friend of Dr. Seabury's that 'they would not find there what they wanted.' There seems little doubt that it was Routh who urged Seabury to apply to Scotland. (It should be remembered that as the Episcopal Church in Scotland was not established, the oath of allegiance to the king would not be required.)

"Seabury as a young man had studied medicine in Edinburgh and, through a friend in Edinburgh and other friends in England, he approached Bishop Kilgour, the Primus of the Scottish Church. The Primus readily consented, and on Sunday, November 14, 1784, in the Chapel of Bishop Skinner at his house in Aberdeen, Samuel Seabury was consecrated to the episcopate by the Bishop of Aberdeen, the Bishop of Ross and Moray, and the Coadjutor Bishop of Aberdeen. To quote the words of Mr. Middleton in his *Life of Dr. Routh*: 'Thus to the American Church was given, to use the words of Kilgour, the chief consecrator, a free, valid and purely ecclesiastical Episcopacy.'

"Dr. Seabury shortly returned to America and at once [1785] began his apostolic labors. It has been suggested that the fact that he was acceptably received in Connecticut, and allowed to carry out his duties

without hindrance, may have influenced those in authority in England to reconsider the position. Be that as it may, a few years later changes were made in English law to allow American bishops to be consecrated in England without taking the oath of allegiance, and on February 4, 1787, William White was consecrated Bishop of Pennsylvania, and Samuel Provoost, Bishop of New York, by the two English Archbishops assisted by the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and the Bishop of Peterborough. When Bishop Seabury returned to America, there were perhaps 100 ordained clergymen of the Episcopal Church in the newly constituted Republic. In the year 1949, 165 years later, there were (including overseas missions) 160 Bishops, 6,547 clergy, and 1,671,366 communicants.

"Such in brief is the story of the foundation of the American Episcopate."

Later, on September 17, 1792, Bishop Seabury joined with the three other bishops in America who had been consecrated by bishops of the Church of England, in consecrating Thomas John Claggett as first Bishop of Maryland—the first consecration of a bishop on United States soil. Thus, every bishop in the American Episcopal Church today can trace his episcopal orders through both the Church of Scotland and the Church of England, back through the centuries to the first bishops, the Apostles. This is what is meant by Apostolic Succession.

This is why both the Cross of St. Andrew, the Patron Saint of Scotland, and the Cross of St. George, the Patron Saint of England, are represented on our Episcopal Church Flag.

In connection with the Church Flag, it is interesting to note that it is incorporated in the Presiding Bishop's Seal. Until 1943, the Presiding Bishop was also the bishop of a diocese and could use the diocesan seal, but when the canons were revised, the Presiding Bishop was obliged to resign his diocese, which meant that he had no official seal. With this in mind, Bishop Tucker wrote the following:

"Of course, nothing official could be adopted, I suppose, except by action of General Convention; but if in the meanwhile someone who is expert in these matters could give me the design for a suggested seal, I could use it temporarily, instead of signing official documents with a ten cent piece, as I have sometimes had to do."

Immediately thereafter, the design was put in the hands of competent craftsmen and the seal produced.

With an increasing number of parishes using the new Church flag at divine service, there has risen the question of the proper ceremonial usage to be followed. The matter is of particular importance when it

involves the use of the Church flag with the American flag.

The War Department prescribes flag rules for use in the army, but it has not laid down any rules for civilian use. Neither is there any federal law pertaining to this matter. Some individual states have enacted laws regarding the display of the national flag, but obviously this article cannot include these. A local post of the American Legion would doubtless have information concerning such laws in its particular locality.

There is, however, an unofficial but generally accepted code of flag etiquette. This code was compiled on Flag Day, June 14, 1923, by representatives of some sixty-eight patriotic organizations who met in Washington for the purpose of drawing up some rules to standardize the manner of displaying and using the American flag and other flags with it.

This code states that when the American flag is carried in procession with another flag, it must have the place of honor which is the right-hand side of the column, the other flag being on the left. If there is a line of flags, then the American flag should be carried alone in front of the center of that line.

If the Church flag is flown outside the church on the same halyard with the American flag, the latter should always be at the peak of the flagpole. No other flag should ever be flown above the American flag. If the flags are flown from adjacent staffs, the other flag must not be placed to the right of the American flag, that is, to the observer's left. In all instances, the American flag should be hoisted first and lowered last. No other flag or pennant should be placed above or, if on the same level, to the right of the flag of the United States of America, except during church services conducted by naval chaplains at sea, when the church pennant may be flown above the flag during church services for the personnel of the Navy.

It may be questioned whether a secular code or military precedent should govern the display of the Church's own flag within the chancel of a church, but it seems reasonable that even inside the church, precedence should be given to the American flag. This does not contravene the declaration of the House of Bishops that "the Cross is above the flag"; the Cross, as the symbol of Christianity, of course, takes precedence over any national emblem. But the flag of the Episcopal Church, which represents a particular division of Christendom, is not entitled to the same precedence.

The United States Recruiting Service says:

"In churches, when the American flag is displayed in the body of the church, it should be flown from the staff placed in the position of honor at the congregation's right as they face the clergyman. The

service flag, the state flag, or other flags should be at the left of the congregation. From the chancel, the flag of the United States should be placed on the clergyman's right as he faces the congregation (the Gospel side), and the other flag at his left."

"The Way to Peace"

A Sermon preached by Bishop Charles H. Brent
in Canterbury Cathedral, November 25, 1928¹

MEN AND WOMEN OF ENGLAND:

AS chosen representatives of the Episcopal Church in America, carrying a tribute of affection and esteem to your archbishop² upon his retirement, and to attend upon the new archbishop,³ to whom we bear a message of Godspeed upon the occasion of his enthronement, my dear friend, Dr. Ogilby,⁴ and I desire from this pulpit to declare to you with what fellow-feeling, unity of purpose, and brotherly friendship we stand in your midst. Though we come to you from across the sea, we come not as strangers and foreigners but as members of the same household of faith, serving a common Lord, stayed by a common hope. Your reception of us in the welcome of loving hearts into the bosom of your family.

This is a moment of change for you. Your former archbishop for a quarter of a century, though holding the sceptre of official authority, has ruled with the pastoral staff of love. Though absent in the body, his benign presence is and ever will be with you as a living force. He can never die. He will live, not as a rival to his successor in office, but as the glowing example in life and labor for all future archbishops of Canterbury.

To the newly elected archbishop, we look as to one well known in America. He came to us during the turbulence of the Great War, the first archbishop of York to cross the Atlantic, and inspired and steadied us by counsels of measured wisdom. With eager sympathy we watch him

¹ This sermon is the last of the hitherto unpublished writings of Bishop Charles Henry Brent (1862-1929) in the hands of the Rev. Frederick Ward Kates, rector of St. Paul's Church, Baltimore, Maryland, who edited the three preceding published articles in *HISTORICAL MAGAZINE*:

(1) "Walking With God," XXV (1956), pp. 317-352.

(2) "The Inner Life of a Modern Saint," XXVI (1957), pp. 123-153.

(3) "My Little Book of Praise," XXVII (1958), pp. 89-111.

² RANDALL THOMAS DAVIDSON (1848-1930), Archbishop of Canterbury, 1903-1928. He had resigned on account of ill health.

³ COSMO GORDON LANG (1864-1946), Archbishop of York, 1908-1928, and Archbishop of Canterbury, 1928-1942.

⁴ The Rev. REMSEN B. OGILBY (1881-1943) had been a missionary in the Philippines under Bishop Brent. At the time of the preaching of this sermon, he was president of Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut (1920-1943). See *Stowe's Clerical Directory*, 1941, pp. 212-213.

take up the responsibilities of his weighty office, and hail him as a leader competent to bind our Church and the Church of England in a common effort to hasten the day when there will be throughout Christendom one flock, one Shepherd. We assure him of our prayers, our cooperation and our love.

It will be but continuity of thought to consume the balance of my time in this historic pulpit by thinking not merely of the unity of your Church and ours, of your country and America—important as these thoughts are, but chiefly of that completeness of life throughout the world which we Christians have as an ideal and a hope, a purpose and a goal, when will be acclaimed, in truth and in fact, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all, who is above all and through all and in all.

You laymen are familiar with the thought of Christian unity. I wonder, however, if you think of it with the same fiery passion that moved St. Paul. Do you view it as something academic, to be worked out by ecclesiastics and scholars, and by them alone? If so, you err. Theologians are essentially and of necessity narrow. They are scientists. Their thinking provokes controversy. Up to the present, the divisive influence of the theologian has been as great as his unitive influence. One of the most eminent living theologians said in my hearing that he could not conceive of his agreeing on any subject with a certain other theologian of the same communion.

Of late, an effort has been fostered by your dean to take out of their intellectual isolation the religious thinkers of different countries. A year ago German, Swedish and English theologians met in Canterbury to discuss the Kingdom of God. This year a similar group met in Wartburg, Germany, to consider Christology. An interesting feature of these gatherings is that the conferees openly state that "it is important to remember that these conferences are strictly theological and not part of any immediate policy of ecclesiastical reunion."⁵

Even were we united in theology, that would not by any means imply Christian unity. What does make for unity in these conferences is the life together, the common study of a given subject, the attempt of each to understand the viewpoint of those who differ from him, and the discovery that seemingly opposite viewpoints are supplementary rather than antagonistic to one another. Unity must never be confused with uniformity. Unity has in its pure white light all the colors of the rainbow.

All formal attempts at realizing unity must be humanized by personal contacts. For a unity of communion, of life touching life, ought to

⁵ *Theology*, Vol. xvii (Oct. 1928), p. 180.

precede, or at least supplement, unity of thought. With this in view, the Episcopal Church in America at its recent deliberative assembly⁶ appointed a commission of theologians, looking towards organic unity, to make an active study with similar groups of theologians from the Methodists and Presbyterians of matters of Christian morality. The exact subject does not bulk large in the proposed conferences. The idea is to get men of diverse views around a common table where they may learn that friends alone may differ and not quarrel. The Methodists were chosen because they were driven out of the Church by its indifference and low spiritual condition in Wesley's day. No corporate effort to express penitence or to rewin them to fellowship has hitherto been made. As for the Presbyterians, their differences and ours centre about the transmission of orders and the administration of sacraments. Their theology is not far removed from ours.⁷

Whatever theologians may be able to do, by themselves they are powerless to create unity. Where they leave off, the mass of the rank and file, the great body of the laymen of the Church, comes in. It is striking that in the United Church of Canada, the Methodists, the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists consummated their union through the people acting in their representative assemblies rather than through their theologians. I apprehend the same is true of the slow, healthy process which has brought the Established and the United Free Churches of Scotland so far along the road to organic unity. Unity is the *people's* problem, and can be had only by their active and intelligent labor.

There are three simple duties, all of them extremely difficult, which the layman must perform as an indispensable contribution to Christian unity. *First*, recognizing that there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, he can cultivate that inner spirit which will recognize every Christian of whatever name as a brother beloved in the Lord. Immediately this is done, the barriers between party and party within the Church, between Free Churchmen, Roman Catholics and members of the Church of England fall away and unity *is*. As a boy, I was brought up in the strictest sect of the Pharisees. I now, in the closing days of my life, look upon it as one of my chief sins that I failed then to recognize in the members of the Free Churches brothers beloved. I honestly thought that covenant with God was an external and formal thing, purely a matter of theological concept and ecclesiastical order, and that all outside the Church of England, on the right hand and the left, could be saved only by a special act

⁶ This refers to the General Convention of 1928, which met in Washington, D. C., and which completed the revision of the Prayer Book begun in 1913.

⁷ The General Convention of 1946 did not agree with this view.

of God's mercy. If we judge the tree by its fruits, the same saintliness grows on the different branches of the Church Universal, and the same potentialities of goodness reside in all.

If we once acknowledge and adore one God and Father of us all, who is above all and through all and in all, we cannot fail to look upon all men as brethren and especially upon those who are of the household of faith.

Secondly, we should endeavor to discover and openly admit the strong features of communions separate from our own. This is good strategy for battle. General Grant used to look for the strength of the opposing army and not discount it. If this is good strategy for war, it is equally good strategy for peace. It is only in this way that mutual respect between the Churches can be developed. Ought we not to start within the borders of our own Communion? I speak as a Catholic. Ours is a Church which is inclusive rather than exclusive. There are represented within its legitimate freedom two main views, both of which have always been characteristic of religious life. There are those who are sacerdotal and sacramental, and there are those to whom the outer form means little, but who approach God by a direct ascent of the soul to Him. Both are equally social in their outlook. Why cannot each supplement, rather than bitterly oppose the other, as though God blessed both equally and did not bless the one and curse the other?

Thirdly, we should cultivate that breadth of vision which breeds a loyalty that is first of all true to the Great Church Catholic and only in the next place to our own Communion. This is far from the spirit of indifferentism which professes loyalty to a great ideal in general but is loyal to nothing in particular. It is rather the spirit which, being well rooted in faith in Christ as revealed in our own Christian group, is freed to study and to rejoice in the manifestations of God's Spirit wherever they may be.

I want to carry this conception of unity on to the relations between nation and nation. The same evils as in the Churches separate us and cause war; the same conciliatory processes will unite us. As a boy, I looked on every people but those of the land of my birth with unbelievable arrogance. We were the chosen people, God's anointed. Those of the same racial stock but of independent political organization were to be tolerated. The Chinese, Indians and undeveloped races were but curiosities, to be exploited where necessary for our advantage, and hardly to be dealt with as human beings—certainly not as brothers beloved. Patriotism was loud-shouting, the exaltation of our own national life to the disadvantage and humiliation of our national neighbours.

Times are slowly changing. Men can no longer hold such views with easy mind. International consciousness is gradually rising into an international conscience without abatement of genuine patriotism. We are slowly but inevitably beginning to view mankind as intended by God to be a family. No one can look on war or that which may lead to war with equanimity. Our attention is caught by such words as those of Erasmus: "War has glory only for the inexperienced"; or of Wellington: "War is not compatible with the teaching of Christ"; or of Lee: "I have largely wasted my life. The mistake began in my having a military education." So that the President of my own country in an Armistice Day address, which has provoked—justly provoked—much controversy, can say:

"The whole essence of war is destruction. It is the negation and antithesis of human progress. No good thing ever came out of war that could not better have been secured by reason and conscience.

"Every dictate of humanity constantly cries aloud that we do not want any more war. We ought to take every precaution and make every honorable sacrifice, however great, to prevent it."

The Kellogg multilateral treaties, which renounce war as a national policy and pledge the signatories to peaceful settlement of disputes, should have the right of way in the American Senate over any naval plans pending, and should be speedily ratified. Of the Kellogg Pact your own Prime Minister⁸ says in generous words:

"I believe the time may come when in the histories of this period there will be no greater act credited to the United States of America than this—that in this year she had the honor of voicing the aspirations and desires of mankind in presenting that Pact to the nations for signature. Only let us remember what we have signed. It is so tremendous a thing that few of us realize it, and the result of that signature will be nothing unless the nations, realizing to what they are committed, make up their minds that that signature shall be honored to the end of time."

Solemn words, to be taken to heart by no nation more than by my own beloved country. The treaty almost completes a formal arch of peace—though not quite. The defect is that there is no Supreme Court of the World accepted by all the nations, to which we may refer disputes for final settlement. America, unfortunately, as I view it, recognizes neither the Covenant of the League nor the Permanent Court of International Justice, to which the other nations of the world as a whole would instinctively turn. So the keystone of the arch is missing.

So much for formal efforts of governments and diplomats to woo

⁸ STANLEY BALDWIN was Prime Minister, 1924-1929, and the one here referred to.

peace for the world. But the parallel with the theologians is perfect. As the theologians can go only so far without the active cooperation of the multitudes of unofficial Christians, so it is with statesmen in relation to the nation. The ordinary citizen has the major part of the task resting on his shoulders. There can be no breach of the peace in the modern state without the assent of the whole body politic. The citizen, therefore, must adopt and apply the same three principles in his consideration of the relationship of nations that the layman does in his concept of the unity of the Church. It is not merely that he must oppose war—the settlement by force and guile of international disputes; but he must espouse peace and peaceful ways—arbitration, conciliation and the spirit of brotherhood.

First, he must embrace the truth that God had made of one essence all nations of men. It is not too much to expect him to look with intelligent eyes on the interests of other nations as he looks on his own. He must learn to value man as man and not as American, English, Chinese or what not.

Secondly, he must learn to rejoice in those fine characteristics of other nations which distinguish them and individualize them, just as a man rejoices in the greatness of his friend. This is not to depreciate but to glorify patriotism. Boastfulness, whether in an individual or a nation, is a hateful thing. If, for example, America can rejoice in the transportation of 2,000,000 soldiers to France without loss of life, it adds rather than detracts from our joy if we give credit to the British Navy which so safeguarded the seas as to make it possible. If America congratulates herself that her army knew no setbacks or defeat in the brief time that she was a combatant, she rounds out the truth by paying tribute to those nations that fought America's battles for the three heartrending years before, and so prepared the way for victories readily won. If America emerged from the welter of battle with eye undimmed and resources unabated, which enabled her to become the creditor nation of the world and to aid in the reconstruction of Europe, she adds to her honor by generous recognition of the self-sacrifice of those nations which bled themselves white and emptied their coffers in the common cause. If America waged the war at great cost to herself, incurring a debt of fabulous proportions, she should thank God that the balance of that debt is not incommensurate with her resources, as the debts of many other nations seem to be. Ought my country to boast that the war brought us no accession of territory when we do not need it, and when extra-continental possessions are already our Achilles' heel? We cannot deny that hitherto when we have needed new territory, we have secured it, and

when we wanted for our own interest to control a neighbour's territory, we controlled it. Nor may we ever forget that we were offered and refused a mandate with all its anxieties and entanglements. It is not generosity but dispassionate honesty that impels me to state these patent truths.

I need not multiply instances. For obvious reasons, my illustrations are taken from my home land. It is simply an attempt to pay honor to whom honor is due. Each nation must apply the lesson to itself.

The *third* fundamental principle to be adopted and applied is the hardest of all—to make our larger loyalty to mankind and our lesser to our nation. For flabby internationalism I have no use. But I do believe that just as the individual lives for the family, the family for the community, the community for the nation, so the nation should live for mankind if it is to achieve its destiny.

When that most tragic of all social misfortunes happens between nations, I mean misunderstanding, then is the opportunity of the citizen. He must recognize that whatever difference there may be, it is a difference among friends, which can be worked out happily only by an honest and singleminded endeavor to understand. A Chinese proverb says: "Be not disturbed when you are misunderstood. Be disturbed when you misunderstand." It is possible for peace to reign only among men of goodwill. Nothing breeds goodwill—of which I would fain be an ambassador—like understanding, especially understanding of the contrary, the self-willed, the erring.

I am not ashamed to bare my soul to you. I glory in the fact that an incomparable vision holds me in its gracious thrall. It is not so much that I possess it, as that it possesses me. My vision is of a world, in the here and now, at peace and unity with itself. There is no change in the diversity which now obtains. That abides; but a unifying and illuminating spirit pervades the whole. There is one Church, binding man to God and man to man in a common life and purpose—"The holy city of Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God, having the glory of God." "There is no temple therein; for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple thereof." No more is the fact of the Incarnation, with its attendant beneficent truths, blasted and scorched by controversy. All human powers, set free from friction and doubt, which always dim and sometimes paralyze the soul, pour with full stream into the upward- and onward-rushing flood of constructive thought and life.

Nation interlocks with nation in a unity of mutual service, and each brings its glory into the common fund. No longer hampered by war or the fear of war, undreamed of human capacity and might are loosed and developed for the universal public good.

If this vision seems so distant as to be impossible, yet it is a vision which inspires in a Kingdom composed of far vistas. He who now holds it, with the embrace of faith and hope, in his own soul, already possesses the reality, and hastens the coming of that happy day when the affairs of this world will no longer be conducted by the whim of man, but according to the eternal purpose of God as revealed in Jesus Christ our Lord. Whether in this life, or beyond, it is the only kind of world great enough for man made in the image of God.

The Church Historical Society



Is an official agency of General Convention and renders a Churchwide service . . . Gladly answers scores of inquiries each year for biographical and historical data. . . . These inquiries come from all over America and from abroad. . . . Its fine library on American Church history and biography is steadily growing and is increasingly used by students and scholars. . . . Its publications in American Church history and biography have won high praise. . . .

The Society's Library is now housed in the beautiful, new fireproof and air-conditioned building at

*606 Rathervue Place
Austin 5, Texas*

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

of the Protestant Episcopal Church

Four Numbers—March, June, September, December, 1958

INDEX TO VOLUME XXVII (1958)

R—denotes Book Reviews; (bp.) bishop.

Books and Periodicals are in *italics*.

A

- Activities of the Puritan Faction of the Church of England, 1625-1633*, R140.
Aglipay, Gregorio (bp.), 210-228, 231, 239-243.
Aguilar, Manuel N. (bp.), 239, 243.
Aguinaldo, General Emilio, 211, 215, 239.
Albert Schweitzer: The Story of His Life, R150.
American Churches and the Negro, R134.
American Religious Philosophy and the Pastoral Letters of the House of Bishops, 8-84.
Among Our Contemporaries, 5, 137-139.
Anderson, Charles Palmerston (bp.), 280.
Anglican Approaches to Unity, 182-208.
Anglican Theological Review, 5.
Anglicanism; The Thought and Practice of the Church of England, R147.
Apostolic Succession, 329.
Archbishops of Canterbury:
—Benson, Edward White, 186, 189.
—Davidson, Randall Thomas, 188, 190, 192-196, 332.
Archbishops of York:
—Lang, Cosmo Gordon, 193-194, 332.
Army Chaplains at Frontier Posts (1830-1860), 287-306.

- Arnakis, G. G., 156.
Aspects of Culture, R170.
Athenagoras, Embassy for the Christians, R163.
Ayres, Anne, 309-310, 312-313.

B

- Bahlman, Dudley, W. R., 142.
Baldwin, William M., 324-326.
Barber, Rev. Abel, 291-292.
Barber, Rev. George E., 205.
Barnds, Rev. Wm. J., 254.
Barnes, Rev. C. Rankin, 151, 169, 254, 275.
Barrell, Emilio, 242.
Bartter, Rev. George Charles, 100-101.
Bayaca, Gerardo M. (bp.), 231, 239, 243.
Bayne, Stephen F. (bp.), 166.
Be Not Anxious, R169.
Becker, Rev. Richard G., 307, 307n.
Bell, G. K. A. (bp.), 189-190, 192-195.
Bennett, G. V., 143.
Benson, Arthur C., 192.
Benson, Edward White (archbp.), 186, 189.
Bevenot, Maurice, 163.
The Bible and the Human Quest, R163.
Bibliographies:
—American Religious Philosophy and the Pastoral Letters of the House of Bishops, 75-84.

- Concerning Benjamin Sebastian, 6-7.
- Presiding Bishop, Development of Office of, 254-286.
- Binsted, Norman S. (bp.), 209, 209n, 230-236, 239-240, 244.
- Bishop Charles Henry Brent: "Walking with God,"* R136.
- Bishops, Presiding, 254-286.
- Black, Charles L., 251.
- Book Reviews, 130-175.
- Bosher, Rev. Robert S., 133, 141-143, 146.
- Brent, Charles Henry (bp.), 29, 88-111, 111n, 217-218, 220-224, 242.
- The Churches and Unity*, 100-103.
- Epitome of the life of, 90.
- My Little Book of Praise*, 91-100.
- This Day*, a poem, 111.
- Unity*, 103-107.
- The Way to Peace*, 332, 332n.
- Brownell, Thomas Church (bp.), 22, 261, 263.
- Burgess, Frederick (bp.), 324.
- Burleson, Hugh Latimer (bp.), 280.
- Byzantium: Greatness and Decline*, R152.

C

- Cadle, Rev. Richard Fish, 294.
- Calder, Isabel M., 140.
- Cass, Lewis, 292-293.
- Cazenove Gardner Lee, Jr., Lee Chronicle*, R136.
- The Changing Church: Its Architecture, Art and Decoration*, R149.
- Channing, William Ellery, 43-44, 44n, 48.
- Chaplin, Dora P., 167.
- Chaplains, U.S. Army (1830-1860), 287-306.
- Charanis, Peter, 152.
- Charney, Maurice, 174.
- Chase, Mary, 126-128.
- Chase, Philander (bp.), 17n, 23, 126, 126n, 127-128, 260-261.
- Christian Living*, R166.
- Church and Parish*, R148.

- Church Flag, History and Symbolism of, 324-331.
- Church of the Holy Communion, N. Y. City, 308-309.
- The Church, the Ministry and Reunion*, R159.
- Claggett, Thomas John (bp.), 329.
- Clark, Thomas March (bp.), 269-271, 275.
- Clebsch, Rev. William A., 247, 247n.
- Conference on Faith and Order (1927), 206-207.
- Cook, Rev. E. J., 162-163.
- Cornish, Louis C., 225-226.
- Council of Filipino Clergy, 212-213.
- Cragg, Gerald R., 141.
- Crehan, Joseph Hugh, 163.
- Creighton, Bishop, 34.
- Cross, Frank Leslie, 147, 151.
- Cully, Rev. Kendig Burbaker, 147, 149-150, 167-168, 175.

D

- Dandridge, Edmund P. (bp.), 238.
- Davidson, Randall Thomas (archbp.), 188, 190, 192-196, 332.
- Davis, George W., 162.
- DeLaRose, Pierre, 325.
- De Dui, Rev. James, 301.
- de los Reyes, Isabelo, 210, 213-216, 218, 225, 228, 240.
- de los Reyes, Isabelo, Jr. (bp.), 222, 226-231, 233, 237-240, 243-245.
- DeMille, Rev. George E., 130.
- Dewey, John, 55, 57, 59-60, 62-63, 71.
- Diehl, Charles, 152.
- DuBose, Rev. William Porcher, 164.
- Duncalf, Frederic, 250.
- DuPui, Rev. James, 303.
- Dykman, Jackson L., 256.

E

- Early Latin Theology*, R157.
- Eckel, Rev. Edward H., 145, 157, 160, 162.

Editorials:

- Among Our Contemporaries, 5.
- Assoc. Editor Murphy Honored!, 179-180.
- Guide to Photocopied Historical Materials, 180-181.
- On the Threshold of a Victory, 178-179.
- The Rev. Benjamin Sebastian, 6-7.
- Twenty-Seventh Year! Twenty-Seventh Volume!, 4.

Edwards, Jonathan, 39-41, 46.

Eleazer, R. B., 134.

The Episcopal Church in South Carolina, R130.

Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, 247-252.

Evans, Ernest, 164.

Existentialism and Theology, R162.

F

Ferrandiz, Jose, 227.

Ferry, Rev. and Mrs. William M., 288-289.

Fish, Rev. John F., 303.

Flag of the Protestant Episcopal Church, History and Symbolism of, 324-331.

Foakes, R. A., 173.

Fonancier, Santiago (bp.), 230, 233, 243, 245.

Fox, Adam, 171.

Franklin, Benjamin, 41-42, 62.

Fraser, C. M., 139.

Freeman, George W. (bp.), 299-300, 302-303.

Frere, Walter H. (bp.), 195.

Frontier Posts, Army Chaplains at (1830-1860), 287-306.

G

Gailor, Thomas Frank (bp.), 28.

Gallego, Manuel, 239.

Gamble, Richard D., 287, 287n.

Garrett, Alexander Charles (bp.), 276-277.

Gaustad, Edwin Scott, 133.

Gear, Rev. Ezekiel, 297, 303.

Gore, Charles (bp.), 195.

The Great Awakening in New England, R133.

Great Christian Plays, R174.

Greenslade, Rev. Stanley L., 157.

Gregory, Rev. Henry, 301.

Griswold, Alexander Viets (bp.), 17n, 22-25, 259-260.

H

Haeger, Rev. John Frederick, S.P.G. Missionary to the Palatines, 112-125.

Halifax, Lord, 185, 187-201.

Hall, Rev. Joseph H., III, 140.

Hardy, Rev. Edward R., 164.

Harlow, S. Ralph, 167.

Hart, Bishop, 35.

Hayden, Joseph Ralston, 209.

He kanonike apopsis peri tes epikoinonias meta ton heterodoxon, R155.

Hedge, Rev. Frederic Henry, 50, 72.

Henry Wharton, *The Life of John Smith*, R131-133.

Hertzog, Edward (bp.), 217, 221-224.

Hickok, Rev. Laurens Perseus, 53-54.

Hines, John Elbridge (bp.), 248-249, 249n.

Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church:

—Twenty-Seventh Year! Twenty-Seventh Volume!, 4.

A History of Anthony Bek, Bishop of Durham, R139.

Hodges, Rev. Charles S., 297.

The Holy Fire: The Story of the Fathers of the Eastern Church, R154.

Hopkins, John Henry (bp.), 263-264.

House of Bishops:

—Bibliography, 75-84, 285-286.

—Pastoral Letters, 10-74.

—Presiding Bishops, 254-285.

House of Deputies, 12, 17.

- Hubbard, Bishop, 35.
Huntington, Frederick Dan (bp.), 25.

I

- Iglesia Filipina Independiente, History of, 209-246.
Ives, Levi Silliman (bp.), 261.
Ivins, B. F. P. (bp.), 34, 238-239.

J

- James, Francis Godwin, 145.
James, William, 11, 57-59.
Jefferson, President Thomas, 43.
Johnson, Rev. Samuel, 5, 40-41.
Johnston, Robert A., 174.
Journal of the Medical Society of New Jersey, 5.

K

- Kates, Rev. Frederick Ward, 89, 89n, 91, 136, 332n.
Kemper, Jackson (bp.), 297, 301-303.
Kennedy, Harry Sherbourne (bp.), 239.
Kent, Rev. and Mrs., 288.
The King in His Beauty, R173.
Kinzie, Mrs. John, 288.
Kitano, Juan P. (bp.), 231.
Kotsonis, Rev. Archimandrite Hieronymus, 155.
Krumm, Rev. John McGill, 161.
Krusen, Rev. Henry P., 180.

L

- Lambelet, Rev. Clarence A., 168.
Lambeth Conference of 1888, 204-205.
Lang, Cosmo Gordon (archbp.), 193-196, 332.
Lauback, Rev. Frank, 224.
Lee, Alfred (bp.), 266.
Leonard, William Andrew (bp.), 279-280.
Leuba, James H., 11.
Lewis, Bishop, 35.
Lewis, Rev. John, 172,

- Lines, Edward S. (bp.), 17n, 30.
Lloyd, Alfred H., 55, 57.
Lloyd, Rev. Roger, 195-196.
Locke, John, 19-20, 26, 41, 67-63.
Lockhart, J. G., 189-190, 192-193, 200.
Loomis, Elisha, 289-290.
Luce, Jane Houghtaling, 324, 324n.
Ludlow, Theodore R. (bp.), 238.

M

- McCosh, Rev. James, 52-53, 68.
McClinton, Katharine Morrison, 149.
McElwain, Frank Arthur (bp.), 34.
McIlvaine, Charles P. (bp.), 22, 25.
McKean, Rev. Robert, 5.
McManus, Rev. Daniel, 300-302.
Madison, President James, 43.
Malines Conversations, 101, 187-188, 192-201.
Mandell, Rev. Wayland S., 239.
Manney, Rev. Solon W., 303-304.
Manross, Rev. William Wilson, 258.
Marsh, Rev. Cutting, 290.
Marsh, Rev. James, 49, 70.
Marshall, John S., 170-172.
Marshall, Rev. John Rutgers, 327.
Mather, Cotton, 24, 41.
Mathew, Bishop, 206.
Mathews, Shailer, 63.
Mead, George Herbert, 60-62, 71.
Meland, Bernard, 63.
Mercier, Cardinal Désiré F. F. J., 193-201.
Metcalf, Rev. George Reuben, 8.
Middleton, Rev. A. Pierce, 133, 137.
Miller, Rev. Randolph Crump, 169.
The Ministry in Historical Perspectives, R158.
The Moral Revolution of 1688, R142.
More, Paul Elmer, 147.
Morris, George Sylvester, 55, 57.
Moss, C. B., 203, 207.
Muhlenberg, Rev. William Augustus, Social Thought of, 307-323.
Murphy, Rev. DuBose, 5, 137, 165-167, 172-173, 179-180.
Murray, John Gardner (bp.), 279,

N

- Nash, Norman B. (bp.), 238.
 National Cathedral, Washington, D. C., 284.
Nebraska History (June 1957), 137.
 Niebuhr, Rev. H. Richard, 251.
 Niebuhr, Rev. Reinhold, 15, 64-66, 71-72.
North Country Bishop, A Biography of William Nicolson, R145.
 Norton, Rev. John N., 259-260, 260n.

O

- Ocamp, Mrs. Buenaventura, 240.
 Ogg, George, 164.
 Ogilby, Rev. Remsen B., 332, 332n.
 Old Catholic Church, 201-208.
 Otey, James H. (bp.), 302-303.
The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, R151.

P

- Pacific Historical Review* (May 1957), 138.
 Palatines, S.P.G. Missionary to the, 112-125.
 Palma, Jose, 215.
 Pardue, Austin (bp.), 173.
The Parish Comes Alive, R172.
 Parker, Dorothy Mills, 136.
 Parker, Rev. Theodore, 47-49, 54.
 Pastoral Letters of the House of Bishops, American Religious Philosophy and the, 10-84.
 Payne, Robert, 154.
 Penick, Charles C. (bp.), 34.
 Pennington, Rev. Edgar Legare, 263-264.
 Perry, James DeWolf (bp.), 280.
 Philippine Independent Church, 209-246.
 Philosophy, American Religious, 8-84.
 —Bibliography, 75-84.
 Pierhal, Jean, 150.
 Pirone, Frank J., 171.
 Pittenger, Rev. W. Norman, 157, 164.
Plato and the Christians, R171.

- Polk, Leonidas (bp.), 302.
 Portal, Abbe, 192, 194-195, 201.
 Porter, Rev. Jeremiah, 290-291.
 Pratt, James Bisset, 11.
Problemata test ekklesiastikes oikonomias, R155.
 Provoost, Samuel (bp.), 255, 329.
The Pseudo-Cyprianic DePascha Computus, R164.
The Pulpit Rediscovered Theology, R165.
Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution (1660-1688), R141.

Q

- Quezon, President, 209-210.
 Quin, Clinton Simon (bp.), 248, 248n, 250.

R

- Ramirez, Father Ignacio, 305.
 Ramsey, Rev. John R., 148.
Reality, Reason and Religion, R169.
 Relations between the Anglican and Old Catholic Churches, 201-208.
 Relations between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, 182-201.
 Reviews, 130-175.
 Richardson, Rev. Arthur H., 239.
 Rightmyer, Rev. Nelson, 154-155.
 Ritschl, Albrecht, 28, 32, 71, 73-74.
 Rivera, Juan A., 212-213.
 Rizal, Jose, 209-210.
 Robbins, Rev. Howard Chandler, 283.
 Robinson, Rev. Armitage, 195-196.
 Rodriguez, E. B., 240.
 Rogers, Mrs. Mary A., 309.
 Rogers, Fred B., 5.
 Roman Catholic Church, 182-208.
 Royce, Josiah, 32, 55-57, 60, 70-71.

S

- St. Andrew's Theological Seminary, Philippine Is., 246.
St. Cyprian, The Lapsed, The Unity of the Catholic Church, R163.

- Saint Johnland, Long Island, 312-313, 321.
 St. Luke's Hospital, N. Y. City, 310-311, 316.
 Salomon, Richard G., 126-128, 152.
 Scarlett, William (bp.), 34.
 Schneider, Herbert W., 43, 47.
Science and the Love of God, R171.
 Scull, Rev. William, 297-300, 302, 305.
 Seabury, Samuel (bp.), 255, 326-329.
 Sebastian, Rev. Benjamin, 6.
 —Bibliography, 6-7.
 Shapiro, Harry L., 170.
 Sheehan, Father Michael, 305.
 Sherrill, Henry Knox (bp.), 231-232, 237.
 Simcox, Rev. Carroll E., 166.
The Single Eye, R173.
 Smith, Benjamin Bosworth (bp.), 264-266.
 Smith, Rev. P. Kingsley, 5.
 Smith, Rev. Samuel Stanhope, 51.
 Smyth, Rev. Charles, 148.
 Snelling, Mrs. Josiah, 288.
 Social Thought of William Augustus Muhlenberg, 307-323.
 Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 112-125.
 Society of St. Willibroard, 205.
 Southcott, Rev. Ernest W., 172.
 Southwest, Founding of the Episcopal Theological Seminary of, 247-252.
 Steele, Algernon Odell, 163.
 Stewart, Bishop, 34.
 Story, William Wetmore, 88.
 Stowe, Rev. Walter H., 4-5, 179-181.
The Strange Story of a Minister's Life, R172.
 Striker, Laura Polanyi, 131-133.
 Sweet, Rev. Joshua, 303.
 Sweet, Rev. William Warren, 178.
 Switz, Theodore MacLean, 174.

T

- Taft, President William Howard, 214, 225.
 Talbot, Ethelbert (bp.), 276-277.
 Taylor, Brian, 136.

- Temple, William (archbp.), 11-12.
 Theological Seminary of the Southwest, Founding of, 247-252.
 Thomas, Albert Sidney (bp.), 130.
 Thomas, George F., 11.
Thomas Haweis, 1734-1820, R146.
Tertullian, The Treatise Against Her-mogenes, R163.
Tertullian's Treatise on the Incarnation, R164.
Things I Always Thought I Knew, R168.
Thoughts for Times Like These, R167.
 Tillich, Paul, 12, 12n, 64-65, 74.
 Townsend, Rev. Charles, 301-302.
 Tucker, Henry St. George (bp.), 35, 231, 283, 284, 329.
 Tuttle, Daniel Sylvester (bp.), 268, 272, 276.

U

- Understanding the Sacraments*, R166.
 Union Theological Seminary, 72.
Unity in the Faith, R164.
 Unity, Two Anglican Approaches to, 182-208.

V

- Van Dusen, Duncan, 182.
 Vaughan, Cardinal Herbert Alfred, 189.
 Vaux, Rev. Richard, 303.
 Villavaso, Dr. and Mrs. Ernest J., 250.
 Villavaso, Ernest Joseph, Jr., 250.
 Vogel, Arthur Anton, 169.
 von Dollinger, Ignaz, 203.
 Vose, Josiah, 293, 295-296.

W

- Walford, Naomi, 152.
 Waszink, J. H., 163.
 "The Way of Peace": A Sermon, 332-339.
We Want to Know, R167.
 Weatherford, W. D., 134.
 Weaver, Glenn, 112.
 Wedel, Rev. Theodore O., 165.
 West, Edward N., 168.

- Whipple, Henry Benjamin (bp.), 269.
 Whitaker, Rev. Alexander, 138.
 White, William (bp.), 17n, 18n, 19, 19n,
 20-23, 27, 37, 60-69, 73, 255, 258-259,
 329.
White Kennett, 1660-1728, Bishop of
Peterborough, R143.
 Whitehead, Alfred North, 61-62, 71.
 Whittemore, Lewis B. (bp.), 238.
Why I Am an Episcopalian, R161.
 Wieman, Henry N., 63.
William and Mary Quarterly (July
 1957), 138.
William Shakespeare, King Henry VIII,
 R173.
 Williams, Charles David (bp.), 276.
 Williams, Daniel D., 158.
 Williams, John (bp.), 263, 266-269.
 Wilner, Robert Franklin (bp.), 231, 239.
 Wood, Arthur Skevington, 146.
 Wood, Rev. Hubert S., 325.
 Wordsworth, Christopher (bp.), 203-
 204.
 Wordsworth, John (bp.), 202, 204-205.
 Wynn, Harold Edward (bp.), 326.

Y

- Yale and the Ministry*, R158.
 Yates, Miles Lowell, 173.

THIS IS CONVERSION

By Joost de Blank

Archbishop of Capetown

"Conversion is the point of God's redemptive action in Christ—a Conversion that includes Baptism, Commitment, Decisions, Growth, Transformation. It is a Conversion we experience today but which will not be completed till that day when what Christ has done for me is one with what Christ has done in me."—Joost de Blank \$1.25

BELIEVING

A new look at the Nicene Creed

By Canon Herbert Waddams

In this book Canon Waddams shows that the Nicene Creed, the foundation document of the Christian Faith, is not only a reasonable but an indispensable document for understanding the meaning of the Christian message. It safeguards the essential teaching of Jesus and sheds light on Christian basic beliefs. \$2.15

KIRKBRIDE CONVERSATIONS

Introducing Canon Kirkbride

By Harry Blamires

Six dialogues of the Christian Faith by the author of "The Will and the Way," "Cold War in Hell" and other books. The author provides a number of lively conversations with believable characters on a variety of pertinent subjects and vexing problems. (Current Episcopal Book Club selection) \$2.50

HOW TO FACE DEATH

By Cecil Clark

This book is intended to help you with some assurance that the act of dying is not all that terrible, and that Christian belief about death and what happens afterwards is reasonably simple, straightforward and understandable. \$1.15

(Postage paid on cash orders)

MOREHOUSE-GORHAM CO.

14 E. 41st Street, New York 17, N.Y. 29 E. Madison Street, Chicago 2, Ill.
261 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco 2, Calif.

N o w R e a d y !

The Diocese of California
A Quarter Century
1915-1940

By

EDWARD LAMBE PARSONS
Retired Bishop of California

BISHOP Parsons is one of the great bishops and one of the great scholars of his generation. He is a national figure in the fields of Prayer Book Revision, Church Unity, and Christian Social Justice. This is the story of his own Diocese, of which he was the Bishop Coadjutor, 1919-1924, and the Bishop, 1924-1940.

Publication No. 46

\$3.00



Order from

THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY
606 Rathervue Place, Austin 5, Texas

WHO WROTE
THE NEW PRAYERS
in the PRAYER BOOK?

James Arthur Muller

THE COPY, 50c

By JAMES ARTHUR MULLER

"A valuable contribution to
prayer book literature."—*The
Living Church*.

CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY
606 Rathervue Place, Austin, Texas

*A magnificent new series
by one of the greatest
historians of our time*

**KENNETH SCOTT
LATOURETTE'S**

*Christianity in a
Revolutionary Age*

Volume 1

The Nineteenth Century in Europe

**BACKGROUND AND THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC PHASE**

"Informative, illuminating and at
the same time a major contribu-
tion to mutual understanding."

—CARLTON J. H. HAYES

At your bookseller \$6.00

HARPER & BROTHERS, N. Y. 16

*The Intellectual Revolution and
The Anglican Communion*



Walter Herbert Stowe

By WALTER H. STOWE

THE COPY, 25c

"A masterpiece."

—Bishop Maxon

CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY
606 Rathervue Place, Austin, Texas

The H. W. Gray Co., Inc.

"Leading Publishers of Music
for the Episcopal Church"

Agents for:

The Plainchant Publications
Committee London, England
(Edited by Francis Burgess)

~

The St. Dunstan Edition
of Plainchant
(Edited by Winfred Douglas)

~

Novello & Co., Ltd., London

~

S. Bornemann, Paris, France

~

159 East 48th St.
New York 17, N. Y.

Now Ready!

Saint Thomas Church

IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF

New York 1823-1954

By

GEORGE E. De MILLE

Canon of Albany

IN his Preface to this notable history of a great parish, which has one of the most beautiful churches in Christendom, Canon DeMille states:

"I must confess that I came to this study with a preconceived notion of what St. Thomas Parish was like. I was completely wrong. While writing, I have learned, and it is my hope that the reader may profit by my learning and perceive that St. Thomas Parish has a great history, and that it has stood, and stands, for great things in the life of our Church."

Publication No. 47

The Copy, \$3



CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

606 Rathervue Place

Austin 5, Texas

1820-1957

*A Historical Account of
The Protestant Episcopal
Church
in South Carolina*

By The Right Reverend

ALBERT SIDNEY THOMAS, LL.D., D.D., S.T.D.

Retired Bishop of South Carolina

IN 1820, the Rev. Frederick Dalcho, M.D., Assistant Rector of St. Michael's Church, Charleston, published "*A Historical Account of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South Carolina*." Now, Bishop Thomas, a former Rector of St. Michael's, has continued where Dr. Dalcho left off. The result is a highly scholarly volume of immense value and interest, not only to Churchmen, both within and without South Carolina, but to all historical-minded persons and book collectors.

THIS monumental volume of 879 pages covers the history of the two South Carolina dioceses. Included are biographies of the thirteen Bishops; lists of all the clergy who have served the Church in the state, with the dates they served; further appendices cover conventions, diocesan officers, organizations, camps and conferences, and periodicals. In addition to the text, there are 33 pages of excellent photographs of representative churches and of the Bishops. A thorough index follows.

THE book shows the care and diligent research which has occupied Bishop Thomas so many years. It is of inestimable value to scholars and to the Church.

\$7.50 post paid

**THE DIOCESAN HOUSE
138 WENTWORTH STREET
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA**



For Christmas



THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY suggests some of these first-rate historical and biographical books. Each of these volumes is attractively printed, cloth-bound, and of permanent value—a most welcome addition to the Library of any Clergyman or Layman interested in the History of the Church. There are prices to suit every purse, from \$2.50 to \$10.00—most of them at \$3.00 per copy. *See Order Coupon, Advertising Page No. 8.*

•

No. 45. **MARYLAND'S ESTABLISHED CHURCH**, by Nelson W. Rightmyer.

"Students of American Church History know by this time that anything written by Dr. Rightmyer is bound to be a sound piece of scholarly writing. This book is no exception."—CANON GEORGE E. DEMILLE, author of Nos. 16 and 12, *below*.

\$5.00

•

No. 40. **THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN NEW JERSEY**, by Nelson R. Burr.

"I venture to prophesy that this book (784 pages) will stand for a hundred years as the definitive treatment of the subject."—DR. WALTER H. STOWE, *Historiographer of the Church*.

\$10.00

•

No. 38. **EXPLORING THE SILENT SHORE OF MEMORY**, by Henry St. George Tucker.

The Autobiography of our former Presiding Bishop, covering his early life in Virginia, and his ministry in Japan. Bishop Tucker was "one of the human agents used by God to promote the growth of Seikokwai" (the Holy Catholic Church in Japan). As President of St. Paul's University and as Bishop of Kyoto, he was instrumental in developing native leadership in the Japanese Church, thus preparing it for its current opportunity.

\$4.00

•

No. 36-I. **VIRGINIA'S MOTHER CHURCH: VOLUME I, 1607-1727**, by George MacLaren Brydon.

\$7.50

•

No. 36-II. **VIRGINIA'S MOTHER CHURCH: Volume II, 1727-1814**, by George MacLaren Brydon.

\$10.00

"*Virginia's Mother Church* is the most valuable contribution to the history of Virginia made in a long time, and puts Dr. MacLaren Brydon in the front rank of the state's historians. Without this book, the history of Virginia in the colonial and Revolutionary periods could not be understood."—H. J. ECKENRODE, Author of *Separation of Church and State in Virginia*.

Church Historical Society



No. 33. THE GENERAL CONVENTION: OFFICES AND OFFICERS, 1785-1950, by C. Rankin Barnes.

The story of the legislative body of our Church. "It contains a series of brief biographical sketches of the officers of General Convention with an interwoven account of the nature and growth of the duties of their offices. . . . It is the first attempt at such a compilation and it is a very successful one. . . ." —BISHOP WALTER H. GRAY, of Connecticut. **\$3.00**

No. 32. BRITISH HUMANITARIANISM: Essays Honoring Frank J. Klingberg, edited by Samuel C. McCulloch.

"Ministers who seek new sermon material, laymen who wish to enlarge their perspective, and historians who want a fuller understanding of Britain and her empire will gain by perusing *British Humanitarianism*. Once again we are reminded that religious-ethical forces are of superlative importance in human history." —GARLAND DOWNUM, in *The Christian Century*. **\$4.00**

No. 29. A BISHOP OF THE GREAT PLAINS, by George Allen Beecher.

"My letter grows out of my delight with the Beecher book. . . . I could not put it down. . . . I show it to callers, and, if they are non-readers, I show them the pictures. Every one mentioned in the volume comes to life. The pages on Willa Cather are the finest in all literature." —Prof. FRANK J. KLINGBERG, the University of California, Los Angeles. **\$3.00**

No. 28. THE PROVINCE OF THE PACIFIC, by Louis Childs Sanford.

"This is an accurate account of the development of the Episcopal Church in the West by the one best qualified to write in terms of the province, of which he was president for many years. Following a brilliant essay ["Provinces: Ancient and Modern"] by Bishop Parsons, there is the story of the way in which the Church in the West was organized. . . ." —DR. RANDOLPH CRUMP MILLER, in *The Churchman*. **\$3.00**

No. 23. THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN DELAWARE, by Nelson W. Rightmyer.

"The volume on the early history of the Church in Delaware is excellent. I read every word of it at once upon its arrival. Congratulations for another worthy publication." —DR. MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR., Professor of Liturgics, Church Divinity School of the Pacific. **\$3.00**

No. 22. QUARTER OF A MILLENNIUM, TRINITY CHURCH IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK: 1697-1947, edited by E. Clowes Chorley.

"This is the history, covering a period of two hundred and fifty years, of a parish which the Bishop of London described in the anniversary sermon as being 'unique throughout the whole of Christendom.'" —DR. G. MACLAREN BRYDON, *William and Mary Quarterly*. **\$3.00**

See Next Page for Order Coupon ➡



Books for Christmas

[See also, the two preceding pages]



**No. 16. A HISTORY OF THE DIOCESE OF ALBANY, by
George E. DeMille.**

"This excellent and well-documented monograph covers the work of the Church of England and the Episcopal Church in the area surrounding Albany. . . . When they are as well done as this one, they merit the attention of the general student. . . ."—DR. WILLIAM WILSON MANROSS, in *Church History*.

\$2.50

**No. 13. ANGLICAN EVANGELICALISM, edited by A. C.
Zabriskie.**

"The Church Historical Society has once again given us a really valuable volume. . . . Conducted throughout on a high plane, with adequate scholarship, sweet reasonableness, and here and there rising to genuine heights of fervor in presenting evangelical truths, this book should be widely read and pondered."—*Holy Cross Magazine*.

\$3.00

**No. 12. THE CATHOLIC MOVEMENT IN THE AMERICAN
EPISCOPAL CHURCH, by George E. DeMille.**

"A more fair-minded and judicious history of this very controversial question could not be written. . . . Taking the whole record into account . . . it does not appear to the author, or to this reviewer, that the 'Catholic movement' is a Romeward movement or likely to become one."—*The Christian Century*, the leading Protestant journal.

\$3.00

**No. 11. ANGLICAN HUMANITARIANISM IN COLONIAL
NEW YORK, by Frank J. Klingberg.**

"Dr. Klingberg has taken the humanitarian efforts of the English Church in New York and shows that the benighted races were uppermost in the minds of the bishops and leaders of the benevolent societies in the 18th century. . . . This splendid scholar has furnished a book which should open the eyes of those who dismiss the Church's influence as trivial and insignificant."—*The Churchman*.

\$3.00

**No. 10. APOSTLE OF NEW JERSEY—JOHN TALBOT: 1645-
1727, by Edgar L. Pennington.**

"Dr. Pennington has given us an interesting and accurate study of an important figure in our Church's history."—DR. WILLIAM WILSON MANROSS, in *Historical Magazine*.

\$2.50

**CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY
606 Rathervue Place, Austin 5, Texas**

I enclose check in the amount of \$_____ for which please send me the following checked items:

☐ 45 ☐ 40 ☐ 38 ☐ 36-I ☐ 36-II ☐ 33 ☐ 32 ☐ 29
☐ 28 ☐ 23 ☐ 22 ☐ 16 ☐ 13 ☐ 12 ☐ 11 ☐ 10

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone No. _____ State _____

THE CHURCH'S SEMINARIES

Are Indispensable to Its Life and Growth

- 1817 **THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY**
CHURCH SQUARE
NEW YORK 11, NEW YORK
- 1823 **THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY IN VIRGINIA**
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA
- 1823 **BEXLEY HALL
THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF KENYON COLLEGE**
GAMBIER, OHIO
- 1843 **NASHOTAH HOUSE**
NASHOTAH, WISCONSIN
- 1854 **BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL**
140 PERSPECT STREET
NEW HAVEN 11, CONNECTICUT
- 1857 **THE DIVINITY SCHOOL IN PHILADELPHIA**
4205 SPRUCE STREET
PHILADELPHIA 4, PENNSYLVANIA
- 1858 **SEABURY-WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY**
600 HAVEN STREET
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS
- 1867 **EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL**
99 BRATTLE STREET
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS
- 1878 **THE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH**
SEWANEE, TENNESSEE
- 1893 **CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC**
2451 RIDGE ROAD
BERKELEY 3, CALIFORNIA
- 1951 **THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
OF THE SOUTHWEST**
606 RATHERVUE PLACE
AUSTIN 5, TEXAS

Catalogues and other information can be had from the Secretaries

ALL WITHIN THE CHURCH

The Church HYMNAL Corporation

Publishers of all church editions of Book of Common Prayer, Prayer Book Studies and the Hymnal. Books are of the finest quality at surprisingly low prices.

The Church LIFE Insurance Corporation

Low premium cost life insurance for the clergy, lay officials and workers of the Church and their immediate families. Policies to meet your needs.

The Church FIRE Insurance Corporation

Fire and allied lines, fine arts, theft, glass for churches and floaters for clergy . . . costs up to 20% less . . . premiums payable quarterly, without interest.

The Church AGENCY Corporation

Fidelity bonds, boiler insurance, general liability and compensation at advantageous terms.



all affiliated with

the **CHURCH Pension Fund**

30 Exchange Place — New York 5, N.Y.
